arXiv:1111.5115v1 [math.SG] 22 Nov 2011

ON MAGNETIC LEAF-WISE INTERSECTIONS

YOUNGJIN BAE

Abstract. In this article we introduce the notion of a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point which is a generalization of the leaf-wise intersection point with magnetic effects. We also prove the existence of magnetic leaf-wise intersection points under certain topological assumptions.

1. Introduction

Let (N, g) be a closed connected orientable Riemannian manifold and $\tau : T^*N \to N$ be its cotangent bundle. We consider an autonomous Hamiltonian system defined by a convex Hamiltonian

$$F_U(q,p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + U(q)$$

with canonical symplectic form $\omega_{\text{std}} = dp \wedge dq$. Here (q, p) are the canonical coordinates on T^*N, $|p|$ denotes the dual norm of the Riemannian metric g on N and $U : N \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth potential. This Hamiltonian system describes the motion of a particle on N subject to the conservative force $-\nabla U$.

We consider a closed energy hypersurface $F_U^{-1}(k) := \Sigma \subset T^*N$ in an exact symplectic manifold $(T^*N, \omega_{\text{std}} = d\lambda)$ such that $(\Sigma, \alpha := \lambda|_\Sigma)$ is a contact manifold. Σ is foliated by the leaves of the characteristic line bundle which is spanned by the Reeb vector field R_Σ of α. Let $\phi_t^\Sigma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ be the flow of R_Σ. For $x \in \Sigma$ we denote by L_x the leaf through x which can be parameterized as $L_x = \{\phi_t^\Sigma(x) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. If L_x is closed, we call it *a closed Reeb orbit*.

If we take closed 2-form σ on N and consider the twisted symplectic form

$$\omega_\sigma = \omega_{\text{std}} + \tau^*\sigma,$$

then $(T^*N, \omega_\sigma, F_U)$ is called a *twisted cotangent bundle*. The additionally chosen data σ could be interpreted as a magnetic field. A 2-form σ on N is called *$\widetilde{d}$-bounded* if its pull-back $\widetilde{\sigma} \in \Omega^2(\widetilde{N})$ is a differential of a bounded 1-form. In this article, we restrict ourselves to the case when σ is $\widetilde{d}$-bounded. In order to introduce leaf-wise intersections with the above magnetic effect, we need the following definition.

Definition 1.1. A *magnetic perturbation* $\mathfrak{m}$ is a triple (β, σ, θ) which consists of the following data:

- $\beta \in \mathfrak{B} := \{\beta \in C^\infty(S^1) : \beta(t) = 0,\ \forall t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]\}$;
- σ is $\widetilde{d}$-bounded;
- $\theta \in \mathcal{P}_\sigma := \{\theta \in \Omega^1(\widetilde{N}) : d\theta = \sigma\}$.

Key words and phrases. Leaf-wise intersection point, Floer homology, Rabinowitz Floer homology, Isoperimetric inequality, Symplectically hyperbolic manifold.

Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be the set of such magnetic perturbations. We consider an S^1-parameterized symplectic form as follows

$$\omega_{\mathfrak{m}} = \omega_{\beta\sigma} := \omega_{\text{std}} + \tau^*\beta\sigma. \tag{1.1}$$

Definition 1.2. Let us denote by

$$\mathcal{H} := \{H \in C_c^\infty(S^1 \times T^*N) \,:\, H(t,\cdot) = 0,\ \forall t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]\};$$
$$\operatorname{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m}) := \{\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} = \phi^1_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}} \in \operatorname{Diff}(T^*N) \,:\, H \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

The above diffeomorphism $\phi^1_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}}$ is the time-1-map of the vector field $X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}$ which is defined by $\iota_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}}\omega_{\mathfrak{m}} = dH$. When $\mathfrak{m} = 0$, $\operatorname{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$ coincides with the set of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms, denoted by $\operatorname{Ham}_c(T^*N)$.

Definition 1.3. A point $x \in \Sigma$ is called a *magnetic leaf-wise intersection point*, if $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x) \in L_x$ for a time-dependent diffeomorphism $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \operatorname{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$. In other words, there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\phi^\Sigma_\eta(\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x)) = x. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that a leaf-wise intersection point is the $\sigma = 0$ case of a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point. The leaf-wise intersection problem asks whether a given diffeomorphism φ has a leaf-wise intersection point in a given hypersurface Σ. If there exist leaf-wise intersections one can ask further a lower bound on the number of leaf-wise intersections. This problem was introduced by Moser in [36], and studied further in [11, 17, 25, 20, 16, 24, 47, 5, 6, 8, 9, 26, 27, 28, 33]. See [4] for the brief history of these problems. In this article, we investigate the approaches in [3, 30] and generalize their results.

To state the existence results, we need the following preparation. Let $F : T^*N \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hamiltonian function. The Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}^F : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}^F(u,\eta) := \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt.$$

Here $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{T^*N} := C^\infty(S^1, T^*N)$. If $\mathcal{A}^F$ is Morse, by the work of Abbondandolo-Schwarz [2] and Cieliebak-Frauenfelder-Oancea [14], we then have the following non-vanishing result when $* \neq 0, 1$.

$$\operatorname{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}^F) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N), & \text{if } * > 1, \\ \operatorname{H}^{-*+1}(\mathcal{L}_N), & \text{if } * < 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Here $\operatorname{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}^F)$ is the Floer homology for $\mathcal{A}^F$ and $\mathcal{L}_N$ is the free loop space of N.

A leaf-wise intersection points $x \in \Sigma$ with respect to $\varphi \in \operatorname{Ham}_c(T^*N)$ can be interpreted as a critical point of a perturbed Rabinowitz action functional

$$\mathcal{A}^F_H(u,\eta) = \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u)dt.$$

Here the additional Hamiltonian $H : T^*N \to \mathbb{R}$ generates φ. For a generic Hamiltonian for which $\mathcal{A}^F_H$ is Morse, Albers-Frauenfelder [4] constructed an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{FH}(\mathcal{A}^F_H) \cong \operatorname{FH}(\mathcal{A}^F). \tag{1.4}$$

Now we construct the action functional whose critical points give rise to magnetic leaf-wise intersection points. On $\mathcal{A}_H^F$, we add an additional decoration

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{L} &\to \mathbb{R} \\ u &\mapsto \int_0^1 \beta(t)\widetilde{\tau}^*\theta(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t\widetilde{u}(t)]dt. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\widetilde{\tau} : T^*\widetilde{N} \to \widetilde{N}$ and $\widetilde{u} : S^1 \to T^*\widetilde{N}$ is a lifting of u. [1] Now we define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \mathcal{A}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}^F(u,\eta) := \mathcal{A}_H^F(u,\eta) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u).$$

Then the critical point (u,η) of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ gives a magnetic leaf-wise intersection $u(\frac{1}{2})$, see Proposition 2.2.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ be a closed hypersurface with a defining Hamiltonian F. Let $(H,\mathfrak{m})$ be a generic pair such that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse. Then* $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ *is well-defined.*

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ be a closed hypersurface with a defining Hamiltonian F. Let $(H,\mathfrak{m})$ be a generic pair such that $\mathcal{A}_H^F$, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are Morse. Then*

$$\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F) \cong \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

By these results, if $\dim \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N) = \infty$ then we have infinitely many critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$. This implies that there are infinitely many magnetic leaf-wise intersections or a *periodic* one which means that the leaf on which it lies forms a closed Reeb orbit. We exclude the latter case generically, as follows.

We call a hypersurface $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ *non-degenerate* if closed Reeb orbits on Σ form a discrete set. A generic Σ is non-degenerate, see [12, Theorem B.1]. If Σ is non-degenerate, then periodic leaf-wise intersection points can be excluded by choosing a generic Hamiltonian function, see [3, Theorem 3.3]. With the above generic Hamiltonian, Albers-Frauenfelder conclude that there are infinitely many leaf-wise intersection points on Σ, under the topological assumption $\dim \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N) = \infty$.

By the above reason, we only consider *non*-periodic (magnetic) leaf-wise intersection points. In this article, a *generic* (Hamiltonian) diffeomorphism or a *generic* pair means that a certain action functional is Morse and there is no periodic leaf-wise intersections. Precise conditions are listed in Definition 2.3. Thus we conclude the following existence result for magnetic leaf-wise intersections.

Corollary 1.6. *Let N be a closed connected orientable manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. Let Σ be a non-degenerate hypersurface in T^*N. Suppose that* $\dim \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N) = \infty$. *If $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in$* $\mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N,\mathfrak{m})$ *is generic then there exist infinitely many magnetic leaf-wise intersection points.*

In order to state the further result, we need the following notion. Let $\mathcal{L}_N$ be the free loop space of (N,g). The energy functional $\mathcal{E}_g : \mathcal{L}_N \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_g(q) := \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2}|\dot{q}|_g^2 dt.$$

For given $0 < T < \infty$, denote by

$$\mathcal{L}_N(T) := \Big\{ q \in \mathcal{L}_N \,:\, \mathcal{E}_g(q) \leq \frac{1}{2}T^2 \Big\}.$$

---

[1] Note that the action functional $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ does depend on the choice of a primitive θ and the choice of lifting $\widetilde{u}$. For the well-definedness of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, we fix a fundamental region $\underline{N} \subset \widetilde{N}$ and assume that $\widetilde{u}(0) \in \underline{N}$.

Let Σ be a non-degenerate fiberwise starshaped hypersurface with a defining Hamiltonian F and $\varphi = \phi^1_{X_H} \in \mathrm{Ham}_c(T^*N)$ be a generic Hamiltonian diffeomorphism. Given $T > 0$ let us define

$$n_{\Sigma,\varphi}(T) := \#\{x \in T^*N \,:\, \phi^\Sigma_\eta(\varphi(x)) = x,\ 0 < \eta < T\}.$$

Theorem 1.7. *Let N be a closed connected oriented manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. Let Σ be a non-degenerate fiberwise starshaped hypersurface in T^*N. Let g be a bumpy Riemannian metric on N with S^*_gN contained in the interior of the compact region bounded by Σ. Assume that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$ is generic. Then there exists a constant $c = c(N, g, \Sigma, \varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}) > 0$ such that the following holds: For all sufficiently large $T > 0$,*

$$n_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(T) \geq c \cdot \mathrm{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_*\big(\mathcal{L}_N(c(T-1))\big) \to \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N)\}. \tag{1.5}$$

Under certain topological assumption on N, the right hand side of (1.5) grows exponentially with T. Denote by $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ the fundamental group of N modulo conjugacy classes. Then the connected components of $\mathcal{L}_N$ corresponds to the elements of $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$, hence the exponential growth rate of $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ implies that

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \mathrm{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_0(\mathcal{L}_N(T)) \to \mathrm{H}_0(\mathcal{L}_N)\} \tag{1.6}$$

has also exponential growth with respect to T, see [32]. Then the following corollary comes from exponential growth of (1.6) and Theorem 1.7.

Corollary 1.8. *Let N be a closed connected oriented manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. Let Σ be a non-degenerate fiberwise starshaped hypersurface in T^*N. Suppose that $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ has exponential growth. If $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$ is generic then $n_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(T)$ grows exponentially with T.*

The main example of such N is any surface of genus greater than one. In these case, the magnetic field σ can be chosen by the volume form of that surface. Other candidates for N are the *symplectically hyperbolic* manifolds which will be discussed in Definition 3.1, Proposition 3.2.

1.1. **Overview.**

We show Theorem 1.5 by constructing an explicit map between $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}^F_H)$ and $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$. In this case, the main issue is a construction of the continuation map between two different symplectic forms by counting gradient flow lines. These type of symplectic deformation problem is studied in [10]. The above construction is deduced from a certain type of isoperimetric inequality for a $\widetilde{d}$-bounded magnetic 2-form.

In proving Theorem 1.7, we heavily need the following result in [30]. With the same assumption as in Theorem 1.7 for a generic $\varphi \in \mathrm{Ham}_c(T^*N)$, the following holds for sufficiently large $T > 0$:

$$\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(a,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f) \geq \mathrm{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_*\big(\mathcal{L}_N(c(T-1))\big) \to \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N)\}. \tag{1.7}$$

Here $\mathrm{FH}^{(a,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f)$ is the filtered Floer homologies for $\mathcal{A}^f$ and $a = a(\varphi) > 0$ is a certain generic value which will not be explained here. In proving this result, Macarini-Merry-Paternain used *the Abbondandolo-Schwarz isomorphism*, *the Morse homology theorem* and a continuation map between a *concentric* family of fiberwise starshaped hypersurfaces, see [30, Section 4.2]. Especially, the authors use a certain version of Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}^f$, see Section 3.2. The additional data f in $\mathcal{A}^f$ is crucial in constructing the latter continuation map.

In this paper, we consider $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ a certain variant of $\mathcal{A}^f$ with respect to the S^1-parameterized symplectic form $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}$ in (1.1). Magnetic leaf-wise intersections arise as critical points of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

We construct again a continuation map between $\mathrm{FC}^{(*,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $\mathrm{FC}^{(*,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f)$. With this continuation map, we can compare the growth rate of $\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(*,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(*,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f)$ when $T \to \infty$. Finally we use the dimension estimate (1.7) and conclude Theorem 1.7.

1.2. **Organization of the paper.** This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we show that $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ is well-defined and construct a continuation map between $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}^F_H)$ and $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$. In Section 3, we define $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and check the well-definedness of the filtered Floer homology of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Then we construct a continuation map between the filtered Floer homologies of $\mathcal{A}^f$ and $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ in a certain action window. In Appendix A and B, we study the generic properties of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my advisor Urs Frauenfelder for fruitful discussions and detailed comments. The author is supported by the Basic research fund 2010-0007669 funded by the Korean government.

2. A perturbation of the Rabinowitz action functional

Let us begin with the *defining Hamiltonian* F of $\Sigma = F_U^{-1}(k) \subset T^*N$

$$F(t,x) = F_{U,k,\rho}(t,x) := \rho(t)(F_U(x) - k). \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\rho : S^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\int_0^1 \rho(t)dt = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{supp}(\rho) \subset \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore, the Hamiltonian vector field satisfy

$$X_F(t,x) = \rho(t) X_{F_U - k}(x) = \rho(t) X_{F_U}(x). \tag{2.3}$$

Definition 2.1. Given a fiberwise starshaped hypersurface $\Sigma \subset T^*N$,

$$\mathcal{D}(\Sigma) := \{F \in C^\infty(T^*N) \,:\, F^{-1}(0) = \Sigma,\ X_F|_\Sigma = R_\Sigma,\ X_F \text{ is compactly supported }\}.$$

We call such Hamiltonians defining Hamiltonians for Σ.

Now, let $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ be a closed hypersurface with a defining Hamiltonian $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = (\beta, \sigma, \theta)$ be a magnetic perturbation on T^*N. Given $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} = \phi^1_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}} \in \mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$, recall that the perturbed action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} : C^0(S^1, T^*N) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt + \int_0^1 \beta(t)\widetilde{\tau}^*\theta(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u}(t)]dt.$$

Critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ satisfy

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \partial_t u = \eta X_F(t,u) + X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u) \\ \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.4}$$

For convenience,

$$\mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) := \{w = (u,\eta) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \,:\, (u,\eta) \text{ satisfies } (2.4)\};$$

$$\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) := \{(u,\eta) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) \,:\, \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) \in (a,b)\}.$$

In the following proposition we interpret the critical point as a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point as in Definition 1.3.

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $(u,\eta)\in\mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$*. Then* $x=u(\frac{1}{2})$ *satisfies* $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x)\in L_x$*, where* $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}=\phi^1_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}}$*. Thus,* x *is a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point.*

Proof. For $t\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]$ we compute, using $H(t,\cdot)=0$ for all $t\le\frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}(F_U)(u(t))&=dF_U(u(t))\cdot\partial_t u\\&=dF_U(u(t))\cdot[\eta\ \underbrace{X_F(t,u)}_{=\rho(t)X_{F_U}(u)}\ +\underbrace{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)}_{=0}]=0,\end{aligned}$$

since $dF_U(X_{F_u})=0$. Hence $F_U(u(t))=c$ for some constant c when $t\le\frac{1}{2}$. Thus,

$$0=\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt=\int_0^1\rho(t)(F_U(u(t))-k)dt=c-k.$$

Therefore $F_U(u(t))=k$ and since $F_U^{-1}(0)=\Sigma$, we have $u(t)\in\Sigma$ for $t\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]$. In particular, $u(\frac{1}{2}),u(0)=u(1)\in\Sigma$.

For $t\in[\frac{1}{2},1]$ we have $F(t,\cdot)=0$. Thus, the loop u solves the equation $\partial_t u=X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)$ on $[\frac{1}{2},1]$, and therefore, $u(1)=\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(\frac{1}{2}))$. We conclude that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(\frac{1}{2}))\in\Sigma$. For $t\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]$, $\partial_t u=\eta X_F(t,u)+X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)=\eta X_F(t,u)=\eta R_\Sigma$, since $X_F|_\Sigma=R_\Sigma$. This means that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(\frac{1}{2}))=u(1)=u(0)\in L_{u(\frac{1}{2})}$. Thus $u(\frac{1}{2})$ is a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point. □

2.1. Floer homology for $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

In this section, we show that $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ is well-defined. Throughout this section, we follow the strategy in [12] with minor modifications.

Definition 2.3. Let Σ be a non-degenerate hypersurface in T^*N with a defining Hamiltonian F. A diffeomorphism $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N,\mathfrak{m})$ with $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}=\phi^1_{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}}$ or a pair $(H,\mathfrak{m})\in\mathcal{H}\times\mathfrak{M}$ is called *regular* with respect to $F\in\mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ if

- $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}=\mathcal{A}^F_{H,\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse.
- $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ has no periodic leaf-wise intersection points.

For a given non-degenerate closed hypersurface Σ, $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is regular for generic $H\in\mathcal{H}$ and $\beta\in\mathfrak{B}$. We discuss the generic property further in Appendix A and B.

Remark 2.4. In order to define gradient flow lines, we need an S^1-parameterized almost complex structure $J(t)$ which is compatible with the S^1-parameterized symplectic form $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}$. This means that

$$g_t(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,):=\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}(\,\cdot\,,J(t)\,\cdot\,)$$

defines a S^1-parameterized inner product on T^*N. We denote the set of such almost complex structures as $\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

Given $J(t)\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, we denote by $\nabla_J\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ the gradient of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to the inner product

$$\mathfrak{g}_J\big((\hat{u}_1,\hat{\eta}_1),(\hat{u}_2,\hat{\eta}_2)\big):=\int_0^1 g_t(\hat{u}_1,\hat{u}_2)dt+\hat{\eta}_1\hat{\eta}_2, \tag{2.5}$$

where $(\hat{u}_i,\hat{\eta}_i)\in T_{(u,\eta)}(\mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R})$ for $i=1,2$. One can check that

$$\nabla_J\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)=\begin{pmatrix}-J(t,u)\big(\partial_t u-X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)-\eta X_F(t,u)\big)\\-\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt\end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 2.5. A positive gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to $J(t) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a map $w = (u, \eta) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R})$ solving the ODE

$$\partial_s w(s) - \nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(s)) = 0.$$

According to Floer's interpretation, this means that u and η are smooth maps $u : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \to T^*N$ and $\eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} \partial_s u + J(t,u)\big(\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u) - \eta X_F(t,u)\big) = 0 \\ \partial_s \eta + \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.6}$$

Proposition 2.6. *If σ is $\widetilde{d}$-bounded then $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\pi_2(T^*N)} = 0$.*

Proof. First choose a map $f : S^2 \to T^*N$, then it suffices to show that $\int_{f(S^2)} \omega_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{f(S^2)} \omega_{\mathfrak{m}} &= \int_{f(S^2)} \omega_{\mathrm{std}} + \tau^* \beta \sigma \\ &= \int_{f(S^2)} \omega_{\mathrm{std}} + \beta \int_{\tau \circ f(S^2)} \sigma \\ &= \int_{f(S^2)} d\lambda + \beta \int_{\widetilde{\tau \circ f}(S^2)} \widetilde{\sigma} \\ &= \int_{\partial f(S^2)} \lambda + \beta \int_{\widetilde{\tau \circ f}(S^2)} d\theta \\ &= \beta \int_{\partial \widetilde{\tau \circ f}(S^2)} \theta \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\widetilde{\tau \circ f} : S^2 \to \widetilde{N}$ is a lifting of $\tau \circ f : S^2 \to \widetilde{N}$. □

Theorem 2.7. *Let $w_n = (u_n, \eta_n)$ be a sequence of gradient flow lines for which there exists $a < b$ such that*

$$a \le \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\big(w_n(s)\big) \le b, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then for every reparameterization sequence μ_n the sequence $w_n(\cdot + \mu_n)$ has a subsequence which converges in $C^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. If we show the following analytic properties then the proof follows from standard arguments in Floer theory:

(1) a uniform L^∞ bound on u_n;
(2) a uniform L^∞ bound on η_n;
(3) a uniform L^∞ bound on the derivatives of u_n.

The issue (1) and (3) are well-studied in usual Floer homology theory. The L^∞ bound on u_n follows from the convexity at infinity of $(T^*N, \omega_{\mathfrak{m}})$. Suppose that η_n is uniformly bounded then the L^∞ bound on the derivatives of u_n follows in the following way. If the derivatives would explode we then obtain a non-constant holomorphic sphere as limit. But by Proposition 2.6 there is no non-constant holomorphic sphere. So we concentrate on the problem (2) in the following arguments. □

Definition 2.8. Define a map $c : \mathcal{H} \times \mathfrak{M} \to [0,\infty)$ by

$$c(H,\mathfrak{m}) := \sup_{(t,u)\in S^1\times\mathcal{L}} \left| \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt \right|.$$

Here $\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}} := \widetilde{\lambda} + \widetilde{\tau}^*\beta\theta$ is a primitive of $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}$ on the universal cover $T^*\widetilde{N}$.

We define

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}} := \int_0^1 \lambda(u(t))[\partial_t u] - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt + \int_0^1 \beta(t)\theta(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u}(t)]dt$$

and denote the *action spectrum* of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}$ by

$$A(\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}) := \{\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}(u) \,:\, u \in \mathrm{Crit}(\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}})\}.$$

Then note that

$$c(H,\mathfrak{m}) = \sup\{|\eta| \,:\, \eta \in A(\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}})\}.$$

Lemma 2.9. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ and $\bar{c} > 0$ such that if $(u,\eta) \in C^\infty(S^1, T^*N) \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J < \epsilon$ then

$$|\eta| \le \bar{c}(|\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)| + 1). \tag{2.7}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_J = \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}_J(\cdot,\cdot)}$.

Proof. The proof consists of 3 steps.

Step 1 : *There exist $\delta > 0$ and a constant $c_\delta < \infty$ such that if $u \in \mathcal{L}$ satisfies $u(t) \in U_\delta = F^{-1}(-\delta,\delta)$ for all $t \in [0,\frac{1}{2}]$, then*

$$|\eta| \le c_\delta \left(|\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)| + \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J + 1\right).$$

There exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\lambda(X_F(p)) \ge \frac{1}{2} + \delta, \quad \forall\, p \in U_\delta$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)| =& \left| \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt + \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(t)) \right| \\
=& \left| \int_0^1 \widetilde{u}^*\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}} - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt \right| \\
=& \Bigg| \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u} - \eta \widetilde{X}_F(t,u) - \widetilde{X}_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)]dt \\
& + \eta \int_0^1 \underbrace{\lambda(u(t))[X_F(t,u)]}_{\ge \frac{1}{2}+\delta} - \underbrace{F(t,u(t))}_{\le \delta} dt + \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt \Bigg| \\
\ge& \frac{1}{2}|\eta| - c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta}\|\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u) - \eta X_F(t,u)\|_1 - c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
\ge& \frac{1}{2}|\eta| - c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta}\|\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u) - \eta X_F(t,u)\|_2 - c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
\ge& \frac{1}{2}|\eta| - c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta}\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J - c(H,\mathfrak{m})
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is the same as in Definition 2.8, $\widetilde{[-]}$ means the lifting of $[-]$ to the universal cover and $c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta} := \|\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty$. Set $c_\delta = \max\{2c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta}, 2c(H,\mathfrak{m}), 2\}$ then this inequality proves Step 1. Note that the finiteness of $c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta}$ is guaranteed by the simple estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{\mathfrak{m},\delta} =& \|\widetilde{\lambda} + \tau^*\beta\theta|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty \\ \leq& \|\widetilde{\lambda}|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty + \|\widetilde{\tau}^*\beta\theta|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty \\ =& \|\lambda|_{U_\delta}\|_\infty + \|\beta\theta|_{\widetilde{\tau}(\widetilde{U}_\delta)}\|_\infty \\ \leq& \|\lambda|_{U_\delta}\|_\infty + \|\beta\theta\|_\infty \\ <& \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2 : *There exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta)$ with the following property. If there exists $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ with $F(u(t)) \geq \delta$ then $\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J \geq \epsilon$.*

If in addition $F(u(t)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$ holds for all $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ then

$$\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_J \geq \left| \int_0^1 F(t, u(t))dt \right| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\int_0^1 \rho(t)dt = \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Otherwise there exists $t' \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ with $F(u(t')) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $0 \leq a < b \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{\delta}{2} \leq |F(u(t))| \leq \delta$ for all $t \in [a,b]$. Then we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J \geq& \|\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u) - \eta X_F(t,u)\|_2 \\ \geq& \left(\int_a^b \|\partial_t u - \underbrace{X_H^{\mathfrak{m}}(t,u)}_{=0} - \eta X_F(t,u)\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \geq& \int_a^b \|\partial_t u - \eta X_F(t,u)\| dt \\ \geq& \frac{1}{\|\nabla F\|_\infty} \int_a^b \|\nabla F(u)\| \cdot \|\partial_t u - \eta X_F(t,u)\| dt \\ \geq& \frac{1}{\|\nabla F\|_\infty} \int_a^b |g_t\left(\nabla F(u), \partial_t u - \eta X_F(t,u)\right)| dt \\ =& \frac{1}{\|\nabla F\|_\infty} \int_a^b |g_t\left(\nabla F(u), \partial_t u\right)| dt \\ =& \frac{1}{\|\nabla F\|_\infty} \int_a^b \left| \frac{d}{dt} F(u(t)) \right| dt \\ \geq& \frac{1}{\|\nabla F\|_\infty} \int_a^b \frac{d}{dt} F(u(t)) dt \\ =& \frac{\delta}{2\|\nabla F\|_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\nabla F\|_\infty$ is bounded from above, we set $\epsilon(\delta) := \min\{\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2\|\nabla F\|_\infty}\}$. This proves Step 2.

Step 3 : *We prove the lemma.*

Choose δ as in Step 1, $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta)$ as in Step 2 and

$$\bar{c} = c_\delta(\epsilon + 1).$$

Assume that $\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(u,\eta)\|_J < \epsilon$ then

$$|\eta| \leq c_\delta \left(|\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(u,\eta)| + \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(u,\eta)\|_J + 1\right) \leq \bar{c}(|\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(u,\eta)| + 1).$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

Definition 2.10. The energy of a map $w \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R})$ is defined as

$$E(w) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\partial_s w\|^2 ds.$$

By a simple computation one can check that $E(w) = \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_-)$.

Proposition 2.11. *Let* $w_\pm \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m})$ *and* $w = (u,\eta)$ *be a gradient flow line of* $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ *with*

$$\lim_{s\to\pm\infty} w(s) = w_\pm.$$

Then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(w_-, w_+)$ *satisfying* $\|\eta\|_\infty \leq \kappa$.

Proof. Let ϵ be as in Lemma 2.9. For $l \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\nu_w(l) \geq 0$ be defined by

$$\nu_w(l) := \inf\{\nu_w \geq 0 \,:\, \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}[w(l+\nu_w)]\|_J < \epsilon\}.$$

Then $\nu_w(l)$ is uniformly bounded as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_-) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\partial_s w(s)\|^2 ds \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w(s))\|_J^2 ds \\
&\geq \int_{l}^{l+\nu_w(l)} \underbrace{\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w(s))\|_J^2}_{\epsilon^2} ds \\
&\geq \epsilon^2 \nu_w(l).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we set

$$\|F\|_\infty = \max_{(t,x)\in S^1\times T^*N} |F(t,x)|, \quad K = \max\{|\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_+)|, |\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_-)|\}.$$

By definition of $\nu_w(l)$, we get $\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}[w(l+\nu_w(l))]\|_J < \epsilon$. Then we can use Proposition 2.9 to obtain the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|\eta(l+\nu_w(l))| &\leq \bar{c}(|\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}[w(l+\nu_w(l))]| + 1) \\
&\leq \bar{c}(K+1).
\end{aligned}$$

By using the above estimate we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta(l)| &\leq |\eta(l+\nu_w(l))| + \left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \dot{\eta}(s)ds\right| \\ &\leq |\eta(l+\nu_w(l))| + \left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt\ ds\right| \\ &\leq \bar{c}(K+1) + \|F\|_\infty \nu_w(l) \\ &\leq \bar{c}(K+1) + \frac{\|F\|_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_-))}{\epsilon^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The right hand side is independent of the gradient flow line w and $l \in \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\kappa = \bar{c}(K+1) + \frac{\|F\|_\infty(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w_-))}{\epsilon^2},$$

then this proves the proposition. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Now we are ready to define the Floer homology of $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$. By choosing a generic pair $(H, \mathfrak{m}) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathfrak{M}$, we may assume that $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ is Morse. Take a critical point $w = (u, \eta)$ of $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$. Since $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ is Morse, $u : S^1 \to T^*N$ is a non-degenerate orbit. Thus we can associate to u a well-defined integer the *Conley-Zehnder index* $\mu_{\mathrm{CZ}}(u)$. See [43] and [1] for the definition and details of the Conley-Zehnder index.

Let us define $\mu(w) := \mu_{\mathrm{CZ}}(u)$ and denote by $\mathrm{Crit}_k^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m})$ the set of critical points w with $\mu(w) = k$ and $a < \mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}(w) < b$. Now we define

$$\mathrm{FC}_k^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}) := \mathrm{Crit}_k^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}) \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

For a generic almost complex structure $J(t) \in \mathcal{J}_\mathfrak{m}$ and given $w_\pm \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m})$, we denote by

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(w_-, w_+) &:= \{w(s) \,:\, w \text{ satisfies (2.6)}, \ \lim_{s\to\pm\infty} w(s) = w_\pm\}; \\ \mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+) &:= \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(w_-, w_+)/\mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

The above $\mathbb{R}$-action is given by translating the s-coordinate. Suppose further that the almost complex structure $J(t)$ is generic, so that $\mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension

$$\dim \mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+) = \mu(w_-) - \mu(w_+) - 1.$$

The boundary operator $\partial : \mathrm{FC}_k^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}) \to \mathrm{FC}_{k-1}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m})$ is defined by

$$\partial w_- := \sum_{\mu(w_+)=k-1} \#_2 \mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+) w_+,$$

where $\#_2$ means $\mathbb{Z}_2$-counting. When $\dim \mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+) = 1$ the moduli space is compactified by adding broken trajectories and this gives us $\partial \circ \partial = 0$. In the $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ case, the compactification of $\mathcal{M}(w_-, w_+)$ is guaranteed by Theorem 2.7 with Proposition 2.11. Then the resulting filtered Floer homology group is defined by

$$\mathrm{FH}_*^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}) := \mathrm{H}_*(\mathrm{FC}_\bullet^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}), \partial).$$

By taking direct and inverse limit, we obtain

$$\mathrm{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}) := \varinjlim_a \varprojlim_b \mathrm{FH}_*^{(-a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}), \qquad a, b \to \infty.$$

□

2.2. **Continuation map between** $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F)$ **and** $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$**.** In this section, we construct a continuation homomorphism

$$\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F) \to \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$$

by counting gradient flow lines of the s-dependent perturbed Rabinowitz action functional. Here

$$\mathfrak{m}(s) := (\gamma(s)\beta, \sigma, \theta) \tag{2.8}$$

are s-dependent magnetic perturbation data where $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ is a cut-off function

$$\gamma(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for} \quad s \le 0 \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad s \ge 1 \end{cases}$$

and $0 \le \dot\gamma(s) \le 2$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the corresponding action functional is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta) = \mathcal{A}_H^F(u,\eta) + \gamma(s)\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_H^F(u,\eta) = \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \eta\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt$.

Now we consider the (s,t)-dependent almost complex structure $J(s,t)$ on T^*N such that $J(s,t) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ for all $s \in [0,1]$ and $J(s,t)$ is independent of s for $s \le -1$ and $s \ge 1$. This almost complex structure induces the (s,t)-dependent inner product on T^*N

$$g_{s,t}(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,) := \omega_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(\,\cdot\, J(s,t),\,\cdot\,),$$

and the following s-dependent inner product on $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathfrak{g}_s\big((\hat u_1,\hat\eta_1),(\hat u_2,\hat\eta_2)\big) := \int_0^1 g_{s,t}(\hat u_1,\hat u_2)dt + \hat\eta_1\hat\eta_2, \tag{2.9}$$

where $(\hat u_i,\hat\eta_i) \in T_{(u,\eta)}(\mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R})$ for $i=1,2$. With the above metric, we obtain

$$\nabla_s\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} -J(s,t,u)\big(\partial_t u - \eta X_F(t,u) - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)\big) \\ -\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt. \end{pmatrix}$$

Then the gradient flow line $w=(u,\eta) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times S^1, T^*N)\times C^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \partial_s u + J(s,t,u)\big(\partial_t u - \eta X_F(t,u) - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)\big) = 0 \\ \partial_s\eta + \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0, \end{array}\right\} \tag{2.10}$$

with energy

$$E(w) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\partial_s w\|_s^2 ds.$$

In order to construct the continuation homomorphism $\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}}$, it suffices to show that the Lagrange multiplier η and the energy of the time-dependent gradient flow line are uniformly bounded. For this purpose, we need the following preparations.

Lemma 2.12. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ and $\bar c > 0$ such that if $(u,\eta) \in C^\infty(S^1,T^*N)\times\mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s < \epsilon$ then

$$|\eta| \le \bar c(|\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)| + 1). \tag{2.11}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_s := \sqrt{\mathfrak{g}_s(\cdot,\cdot)}$.

Proof. The proof is basically the same as in Lemma 2.9 by considering $\mathfrak{m}(s)$ instead of $\mathfrak{m}$. Here we omit the proof. □

Definition 2.13. For a given magnetic perturbation $\mathfrak{m} = (\beta, \sigma, \theta)$, an *isoperimetric constant* $C : \mathfrak{M} \to [0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$C = C(\mathfrak{m}) := \|\beta\|_\infty \|\theta\|_\infty.$$

Note that $C \to 0$ as $\|\beta\|_\infty \to 0$.

Proposition 2.14. *Let $w_- \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_H^F)$, $w_+ \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $w = (u, \eta)$ be a gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ with $\lim_{s\to\pm\infty} w = w_\pm$. If $\|\beta\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(w_-, w_+)$ such that*

$$\|\eta\|_\infty \leq \kappa.$$

Proof. We prove the proposition in 3 steps.

Step 1 : *Let us first bound the energy of w in terms of $\|\eta\|_\infty$.*

$$\begin{aligned} E(w) =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\partial_s w\|_s^2 ds \\ =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \partial_s w, \nabla_s \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\rangle_s ds \\ =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) ds \\ =& \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

We estimate the last term in (2.12) by using the isoperimetric constant C

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) ds \right| \leq& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) \right| ds \\ =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{\gamma}(s) \left| \int_{S^1} \widetilde{u}^* \beta(t) \theta dt \right| ds \\ \leq& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{\gamma}(s) C \int_{S^1} |\partial_t u|_{s,t} dt \ ds. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Here $|\cdot|_{s,t} := \sqrt{g_{s,t}(\cdot,\cdot)}$. From the gradient flow equation (2.10), we get

$$\partial_t u = J(s,t,u)\partial_s u + \eta X_F(t,u) + X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u). \tag{2.14}$$

By inserting (2.14) into the last term in (2.13), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\right|ds \leq&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\dot\gamma(s)C\int_{S^1}|\partial_t u|_{s,t}dt\ ds\\ =&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\underbrace{\dot\gamma(s)}_{\leq 2}C\int_{S^1}|J(s,t)\partial_s u+\eta X_F(t,u)+X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)|_{s,t}dt\ ds\\ \leq&2C\int_0^1\int_{S^1}\Big(|\partial_s u|_{s,t}+|\eta||X_F(t,u)|_{s,t}+|X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)|_{s,t}\Big)dt\ ds \qquad (2.15)\\ \leq&2C\int_0^1\int_{S^1}\Big(|\partial_s u|^2_{s,t}+1+|\eta|\|X_F\|_\infty+\|X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\|_\infty\Big)dt\ ds\\ =&2CE(u)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C\\ \leq&2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C\end{aligned}$$

where $d_{\mathfrak{m}}=d_{H,\mathfrak{m}}:=\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}}\|X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\|_\infty$, $d_F=\|X_F\|_\infty$.

Now by combining the above estimates (2.12) and (2.15), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}E(w)=&\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)-\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-)-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))ds\\ \leq&\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)-\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-)+2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C.\end{aligned}$$

If $\|\beta\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small, then we may assume that $C\leq\frac{1}{4}$. Set $\Delta:=\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)-\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-)$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}E(w)\leq&2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)-2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-)+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C\\ =&2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C.\end{aligned}\qquad (2.16)$$

This finishes Step 1.

Step 2 : Let ϵ be as in Lemma 2.9. For $l\in\mathbb{R}$ let $\nu_w(l)\geq 0$ be defined by

$$\nu_w(l):=\inf\left\{\nu\geq 0:\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(l+\nu)}\big(w(l+\nu)\big)\|_s<\epsilon\right\}.$$

In this step we bound $\nu_w(l)$ in terms of $\|\eta\|_\infty$ for all $l\in R$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}E(w)=&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\|\partial_s w\|_s^2ds\\ =&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\|_s^2ds\\ \geq&\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)}\underbrace{\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\|_s^2}_{\geq\epsilon^2}ds\\ \geq&\epsilon^2\nu_w(l).\end{aligned}\qquad (2.17)$$

Step 1 and the above estimate finish Step 2.

Step 3 : *We prove the proposition.*

First set

$$K=\max\{-\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-),\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)\}$$

By the definition of $\nu_w(l)$, we get $\|\nabla_s \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\nu_w(l)]}[w(l+\nu_w(l))]\|_s < \epsilon$, which enables us to use Lemma 2.12. We obtain the following estimate by using (2.11), (2.15) and (2.16)

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta(l+\nu_w(l))| \leq& \bar{c}\left(\left|\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\nu_w(l)]}[w(l+\nu_w(l))]\right|+1\right)\\ \leq& \bar{c}\left(K+\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\right|ds+1\right)\\ \leq& \bar{c}\left(K+2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C+1\right)\\ \leq& \bar{c}\big[K+2C(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C)\\ &+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C+1\big].\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

By Step 2 and (2.16), we get the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)}\dot{\eta}(s)ds\right| \leq& \left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)}\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt\ ds\right|\\ \leq& \|F\|_\infty \nu_w(l)\\ \leq& \|F\|_\infty \frac{E(w)}{\epsilon^2}\\ \leq& \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon^2}(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C).\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Combining the above two estimates (2.18) and (2.19), we conclude the following

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta(l)| \leq& |\eta(l+\nu_w(l))|+\left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)}\dot{\eta}(s)ds\right|\\ \leq& \bar{c}\big[K+2C(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C+1\big]\\ &+\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon^2}(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C)\\ =& \underbrace{\left(8\bar{c}d_F C+2\bar{c}d_F+4\frac{d_F}{\epsilon^2}\|F\|_\infty\right)C}_{=:\kappa_1}\|\eta\|_\infty\\ &+\underbrace{\bar{c}\big[K+2C(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+1\big]+\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon^2}(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)}_{=:\frac{1}{2}\kappa}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the above estimate is valid for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|\eta\|_\infty \leq \kappa_1\|\eta\|_\infty+\frac{1}{2}\kappa.$$

If we choose $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that the induced isoperimetric constant C additionally satisfies

$$C \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \tag{2.20}$$

then finally we conclude

$$\|\eta\|_\infty \leq \kappa. \tag{2.21}$$

This proves the proposition. □

Lemma 2.15. With the same assumptions as in Proposition 2.14, let $a = \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-)$, $b = \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+)$. Then the following assertion meets:

(1) If $a \geq \frac{1}{9}$, then $b \geq \frac{a}{2}$;
(2) If $b \leq -\frac{1}{9}$, then $a \leq \frac{b}{2}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.14, the Lagrange multiplier η of the gradient flow line is uniformly bounded as follows

$$\|\eta\|_\infty \leq 2\bar{c}\big[K + 2C(2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C) + 2C + 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 1\big] + \frac{2\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon^2}(2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C).$$

Recall that $K = \max\{-a, b\}$ and $\Delta = b - a$. From the fact that $E(w) \geq 0$ and (2.16), we obtain the following inequality

$$b \geq a - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C. \tag{2.22}$$

Now recall that the isoperimetric constant C was given by $\|\beta\|_\infty\|\theta\|_\infty$. By choosing $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ with a sufficiently small L_∞-norm, we may assume the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}\, d_F\, C \leq{}& \frac{1}{32};\\ \left(2\bar{c}\, d_F\, C + \frac{d_F\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon}\right) C \leq{}& \frac{1}{128};\\ \Bigg(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 2\,\bar{c}\, d_F + 4\,\bar{c}\, d_F\, C(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 4\,C + 4\,d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)&\\ + \frac{8\,d_F\|F\|_\infty C}{\epsilon^2}(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}})\Bigg) C \leq{}& \frac{1}{72}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Then (2.22) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} b \geq{}& a - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 2\|\eta\|_\infty d_F C\\ \geq{}& a - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 4\Bigg(\bar{c}\big[K + 2C(2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C) + 2C + 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 1\big]\\ &+ \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon^2}(2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Bigg) d_F C\\ ={}& a - 4\,\bar{c}\, d_F\, C\, K - 8\left(2\bar{c}\, d_F\, C + \frac{d_F\|F\|_\infty}{\epsilon}\right) C\,\Delta - 2\Bigg(\frac{8\,d_F\|F\|_\infty C}{\epsilon^2}(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}})\\ &+ 1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 2\,\bar{c}\, d_F + 4\,\bar{c}\, d_F\, C(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 4\,C + 4\,d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Bigg) C\\ \geq{}& a - \frac{1}{8}K - \frac{1}{16}(b - a) - \frac{1}{36}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

To prove the assertion (1), we first consider the case

$$|b| \leq a, \qquad a \geq \frac{1}{9}.$$

In this assumption, we induce the following estimate from (2.24)

$$b \geq a - \frac{1}{8}a - \frac{1}{8}a - \frac{1}{36} = \frac{3}{4}a - \frac{1}{36} \geq \frac{a}{2}.$$

Now we want to exclude the case

$$-b \geq a \geq \frac{1}{9}.$$

But in this case (2.24) implies the following contradiction:

$$b \geq \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{72} - \frac{1}{16}(b-a) - \frac{1}{36} \geq -\frac{1}{16}(b-a) > 0.$$

This proves the first assumption. To prove the assertion (2), we set

$$b' = -a, \qquad a' = -b.$$

Then (2.24) also holds for b' and a'. Thus we get the following assertion from (1)

$$-b \geq \frac{1}{9} \Longrightarrow -a \geq -\frac{b}{2}$$

which is equivalent to the assertion (2). This proves the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Recall the perturbation data $\mathfrak{m}$ is a triple which consists of (β, σ, θ). First we subdivide $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ into small pieces to have the following properties:

- $\mathfrak{m}^i = (d^i\beta, \sigma, \theta)$, where $0 = d^0 < d^1 < \cdots < d^N = 1$;
- $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i} : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Morse for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, N$;
- $C^i = (d^{i+1} - d^i)\|\beta\|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty$ satisfies (2.20), (2.23) for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$.

Since the Morse property is generic, we can guarantee the second property. Let $\mathfrak{m}^i(s) = (\gamma(s)(d^{i+1} - d^i)\beta, \sigma, \theta)$ be a homotopy from $\mathfrak{m}^i$ to $\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}$. Now we consider a gradient flow line $w = (u, \eta)$ of the time dependent action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i(s)}$ which satisfies

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_s u + J(s,t,u)\big(\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}^i(s)}(t,u) - \eta X_F(t,u)\big) = 0 \\ \partial_s \eta + \textstyle\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.25}$$

and the limit condition

$$\lim_{s\to-\infty} w(s) = w_- \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}), \qquad \lim_{s\to\infty} w(s) = w_+ \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}). \tag{2.26}$$

We then define a map

$$\Psi^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}_{\mathfrak{m}^i\;*} : \mathrm{FC}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}) \to \mathrm{FC}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}})$$

given by

$$\Psi^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}(w_-) = \sum_{\mu(w_+)=\mu(w_-)} \#_2 \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}(w_-, w_+) w_+.$$

Here $\#_2$ means the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-counting and

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}(w_-, w_+) = \{w = (u, \eta) \,:\, w \text{ satisfies } (2.25), (2.26)\}.$$

By Proposition 2.6, $(T^*N, \omega_{\mathfrak{m}^i(s)})$ is symplectically aspherical for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. So there is no bubbling. Thus it suffices to bound the energy $E(w) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|w\|_s^2 ds$ and the Lagrange multiplier η in terms of w_-, w_+ for the compactness of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}(w_-, w_+)$. By the above 3rd condition for $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$, we can use the argument of Proposition 2.14. Especially (2.16), (2.21) implies that the energy of time-dependent gradient flow lines are uniformly bounded.

$$\begin{aligned} E(w) \leq& 2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - 2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) + 4\,C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\|\eta\|_\infty d_F\, C \\ \leq& 2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - 2\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) + 4\,C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\,\kappa(w_-, w_+)\, d_F\, C. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by virtue of Lemma 2.15, we obtain maps for $a \leq -\frac{1}{9}$ and $b \geq \frac{1}{9}$

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}^i}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}(a,b)} : \mathrm{FC}^{(\frac{a}{2},b)}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}) \to \mathrm{FC}^{(a,\frac{b}{2})}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}})$$

defined by counting gradient flow lines of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i(s)}$. Since the continuation maps $\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}^i}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}(a,b)}$ commute with the boundary operators, this induces the following homomorphisms on homologies as follows

$$\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}(a,b)} : \mathrm{FH}^{(\frac{a}{2},b)}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}) \to \mathrm{FH}^{(a,\frac{b}{2})}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}).$$

By taking the inverse and direct limit

$$\mathrm{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}) = \lim_{b\to\infty} \lim_{a\to-\infty} \mathrm{FH}_*^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}),$$

we deduce

$$\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}} : \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}) \to \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}).$$

By juxtaposing $\{\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^i}^{\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}}\}_{i=0}^N$, we obtain

$$\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F) \to \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Here $\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} = \widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^{N-1}}^{\mathfrak{m}^N} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^1}^{\mathfrak{m}^2} \circ \widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}^0}^{\mathfrak{m}^1}$. In a similar way, we construct

$$\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) \to \mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F),$$

by following the homotopies in opposite direction. By a homotopy-of-homotopies argument, we conclude $\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}} \circ \widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_H^F)}$ and $\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} \circ \widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})}$. Therefore $\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ is an isomorphism with inverse $\widetilde{\Psi}_{\mathfrak{m}}$. □

Proof of Corollary 1.6. In Theorem 1.5, we have the continuation isomorphism as follows

$$\widetilde{\Psi}^{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}_H^F) \to \mathrm{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}). \tag{2.27}$$

Since we assume that $\dim \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N) = \infty$, (1.3), (1.4) imply that $\dim \mathrm{FH}_*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \infty$ and consequently the Morse function $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ has infinitely many critical points. Now Proposition 2.2 implies that there exist infinitely many magnetic leaf-wise intersections or a period leaf-wise intersection. But, by Theorem B.1, the latter case can be excluded for a generic $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$. Hence there exist infinitely many magnetic leaf-wise intersections. □

3. On the growth rate of magnetic leaf-wise intersections

In [30], Macarini-Merry-Paternain prove the exponential growth rate of leaf-wise intersections with respect to the period when $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ grows exponentially. Recall that $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ is the fundamental group of N modulo conjugacy classes.

3.1. Symplectically hyperbolic manifolds.

In this section, we investigate the examples and the candidates for the above topological assumption.

Definition 3.1. Let (N, ω_N) be a closed symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$. If the symplectic form ω_N is $\widetilde{d}$-bounded, then (N, ω_N) is called *symplectically hyperbolic.*

Proposition 3.2 (Kędra [29]). *Let (N, ω_N) be a symplectically hyperbolic manifold then $\pi_1(N)$ grows exponentially.*

Proof. The proof consists of 2 steps.

Step 1 : *$\pi_1(N)$ has exponential growth if and only if a ball in $\widetilde{N}$ grows exponentially with respect to the radius.*

Let us choose a Riemannian metric g on N and a base point $x_0 \in N$. Then we define $l_g : \pi_1(N, x_0) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$l_g(s) = \inf\left\{ \int_0^1 |\dot{q}(t)|_g dt \,\middle|\, q : [0,1] \to (N, x_0),\ [q] = s \in \pi_1(N, x_0) \right\}.$$

Now we let $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{\omega}_N)$ be the universal cover of (N, ω_N) and $\widetilde{g}$ be the Riemannian metric lifted from g. Take a fundamental region $\underline{N} \subset \widetilde{N}$ with the base point $\widetilde{x}_0 \in \underline{N}$ which is a lift of x_0. If we consider the following set

$$B_{\pi_1(N)}(T) = B_{\pi_1(N,g,x_0)}(T) := \{s \in \pi_1(N, x_0) \,:\, l_g(s) \leq T\}.$$

Then each $s \in B_{\pi_1(N)}(T)$ corresponds to a deck transformation on $(\widetilde{N}, \widetilde{g})$. Especially, we translate the fundamental region $(\underline{N}, \widetilde{x}_0)$ via $s \in B_{\pi_1(N)}(T)$ and denote it as $s\,\underline{N} \subset \widetilde{N}$. Let us denote by $B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(T)$ the ball of radius T which is centered at $\widetilde{x}_0 \in \widetilde{N}$.

$$\mathrm{vol}\big(B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(T)\big) \leq \mathrm{vol}\big(\bigcup_{l_g(s) \leq T} s\,N \big) \leq \mathrm{vol}\big(B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(T + \mathrm{diam}\underline{N})\big).$$

Here the volume form is given by $\widetilde{\omega}_N^n$. Obviously the above middle term has the same value with

$$\#\{s \in \pi_1(N, x_0) \,:\, l_g(s) \leq T\} \cdot \mathrm{vol}(\underline{N}).$$

This proves Step 1.

Step 2 : *$\mathrm{vol}\big(B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(T)\big)$ grows exponentially with T.*

Let $\theta \in \Omega^1(\widetilde{N})$ be a primitive of $\widetilde{\omega}_N$ and let X be the corresponding Liouville vector field on $\widetilde{N}$. That is $\iota_X \widetilde{\omega}_N = \theta$. We may assume that the given $\widetilde{g}$ satisfies $\|\widetilde{\omega}_N\|_{\widetilde{g}} = 1$, so the norm of X is uniformly bounded by $C := \|\theta\|_{\widetilde{g}}$. Since $\mathrm{vol} = \widetilde{\omega}_N^n$, we have

$$L_X\ vol = L_X\ \widetilde{\omega}_N^n = n\ \widetilde{\omega}_N^n = n\ \mathrm{vol}.$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathrm{Diff}(\widetilde{N})$ be the flow given by the vector field X and $B := B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(1)$. We compute that the volume of the image $\psi_T(B)$ grows exponentially with T as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=s} \mathrm{vol}(\psi_t(B)) &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=s} \int_{\psi_t(B)} \mathrm{vol} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=s} \int_B \psi_t^*\ \mathrm{vol} = \int_B \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=s} \psi_t^*\ \mathrm{vol} \\ &= \int_B \psi_s^*(L_X\ \mathrm{vol}) = \int_{\psi_s^*(B)} (n\ \mathrm{vol}) \\ &= n\ \mathrm{vol}(\psi_s(B)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Hence we get $\mathrm{vol}(\psi_T(B)) = e^{nT}\,\mathrm{vol}(B)$. Since $B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(2CT+1) \supset \psi_T(B)$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}\big(B_{(\widetilde{N},\widetilde{x}_0)}(2CT+1)\big) &\geq \mathrm{vol}\big(\psi_T(B)\big)\\ &= e^{nT}\mathrm{vol}(B).\end{aligned}$$

This proves Step 2. □

As mentioned in the introduction, we are interested in the growth rate of $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$. It is known that $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ has exponential growth rate when N is a 2-dimensional symplectically hyperbolic manifold. But we don't know the growth rate of $\widetilde{\pi}_1(N)$ for any higher dimensional symplectically hyperbolic manifold.

3.2. **Perturbed $\mathcal{F}$-Rabinowitz action functional.** In order to show the exponential growth rate of leaf-wise intersection points, Macarini-Merry-Paternain used the $\mathcal{F}$-Rabinowitz action functional as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{A}^f : \mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R},\\ &\mathcal{A}^f(u,\eta) = \mathcal{A}^{F,f}_H(u,\eta) := \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u)dt.\end{aligned}$$

The above new ingredient $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ needs to satisfy the following properties:

1. f is a smooth strictly positive, strictly increasing function.
2. $\lim_{\eta\to-\infty} f(\eta) = 0$ and f' satisfies $0 < f'(\eta) \leq 1$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$.

The additional data $f(\eta)$ is crucial to the construction of continuation maps between a concentric family of fiberwise starshaped hypersurfaces, see [30, Section 4.2]. We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the set of such $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ satisfying the above conditions.

If we additionally consider the magnetic perturbation, then the action functional becomes

$$\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \mathcal{A}^{F,f}_{H,\mathfrak{m}} := \mathcal{A}^f(u,\eta) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u).$$

One can check that a critical point of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ satisfies

$$\left.\begin{array}{c}\partial_t u = f(\eta)X_F(t,u) + X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)\\ f'(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0.\end{array}\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $f'(\eta) > 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, it is equivalent to

$$\left.\begin{array}{c}\partial_t u = f(\eta)X_F(t,u) + X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)\\ \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0.\end{array}\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Given $-\infty \leq a \leq b \leq \infty$, we adopt the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &:= \{w = (u,\eta) \in \mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R} \,:\, (u,\eta) \text{ satisfies (3.3).}\};\\ \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &:= \{(u,\eta) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \,:\, \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) \in (a,b)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is a positive function, we only consider *positive* (magnetic) leaf-wise intersection points. [2] It would be convenient if $f(\eta) = \eta$ on the action window $(a,b) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ we work with.

Definition 3.3. Given $a > 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}(a) := \{f \in \mathcal{F} \,:\, f(\eta) = \eta,\ \forall \eta \in [a,\infty)\}.$$

---

[2] A (magnetic) leaf-wise intersection point is called *positive* or *negative* if η in (1.2) is positive or negative respectively.

For notational convenience, let us denote by

$$\mathrm{LW}_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(a,b) := \{x \in T^*N \,:\, \phi^{\Sigma}_{\eta}(\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x)) = x,\ a < \eta < b\}$$

and recall that

$$c(H,\mathfrak{m}) = \sup_{(t,u)\in S^1\times\mathcal{L}} \left| \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt \right|.$$

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N,\mathfrak{m})$ *with* $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} = \phi^1_{X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H}$. *Given* $a > 0$, *choose* $f \in \mathcal{F}(a)$. *Then there is a map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ev} &: \mathrm{Crit}^{(a+c(H,\mathfrak{m}),b-c(H,\mathfrak{m}))}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \to \mathrm{LW}_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(a,b) \\ \mathrm{ev}(u,\eta) &= u(\frac{1}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if there is no periodic magnetic leaf-wise intersection points then ev *is injective. With this generic condition for* $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ *we then obtain the following estimate*

$$n_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(a,b) := \#\mathrm{LW}_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(a,b) \geq \#\mathrm{Crit}^{(a+c(H,\mathfrak{m}),b-c(H,\mathfrak{m}))}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Proof. Let (u,η) be a critical point of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$, by the argument in Proposition 2.2, then $u(\frac{1}{2})$ is a magnetic leaf-wise intersection point and its action value becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) &= \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}\big(f(\eta)\widetilde{X}_F(t,u) + \widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)\big) - \int_0^1 H(t,u)dt \\ &= f(\eta) + \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}\big(\widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)\big) - \int_0^1 H(t,u)dt, \end{aligned}$$

thus we obtain

$$|\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) - f(\eta)| \leq c(H,\mathfrak{m}). \tag{3.4}$$

Suppose $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) \in (a + c(H,\mathfrak{m}), b - c(H,\mathfrak{m}))$ then

$$a < f(\eta) < b.$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(a)$, we conclude that

$$a < \eta < b.$$

□

For a given almost complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}_\omega$, let $\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ be the gradient of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to the metric $\mathfrak{g}_J(\cdot,\cdot)$ in (2.5). One can check that

$$\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} -J(t,u)\,(\partial_t u - f(\eta)X_F(t,u) - X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)) \\ -f'(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt \end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 3.5. *A positive gradient flow line* of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to an S^1-parameterized almost complex structure $J(t) \in \mathcal{J}_{\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}}$ is a map $w : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ which solves

$$\partial_s w - \nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0.$$

The above map is interpreted as $w = (u,\eta)$ where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}^1 \to T^*N \times \mathbb{R}$, $\eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \partial_s u + J(t,u)\,(\partial_t u - X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u) - f(\eta)X_F(t,u)) = 0 \\ \partial_s \eta + f'(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{3.5}$$

3.3. **Floer homology for $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$.** Let us first assume that the perturbed $\mathcal{F}$-Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Morse in the sense of Corollary A.4. In order to define the Floer homology for $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$, we need to show that the Lagrange multiplier η is uniformly bounded. We follow the same strategy as in the $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$-case with minor modifications.

Lemma 3.6. There exist $\epsilon, c' > 0$ such that if $(u, \eta) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u, \eta)\|_J \leq \epsilon f'(\eta)$ then

$$\frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) - c'\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J - c\right) \leq f(\eta) \leq 2\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) + c'\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J + c\right). \quad (3.6)$$

Here $c = c(H, \mathfrak{m})$ as in Definition 2.8.

Proof. The proof consists of 2 steps.

Step 1 : *There exist constants $\delta, c' > 0$ such that if $u \in \mathcal{L}$ satisfies*

$$u(t) \in U_\delta := F^{-1}(-\delta, \delta), \quad \forall t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$$

then (3.6) holds.

There exist $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} + \delta \leq \lambda(X_F(p)) \leq \frac{3}{2} - \delta, \quad \forall\, p \in U_\delta.$$

Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) &= \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt + \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(t)) \\
&= \int_0^1 \widetilde{u}^*\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}} - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u} - f(\eta)\widetilde{X}_F(t,u) - \widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)]dt \\
&\quad + f(\eta)\int_0^1 \underbrace{\lambda(u(t))[X_F(t,u)]}_{\geq \frac{1}{2}+\delta} - \underbrace{F(t,u(t))}_{\leq \delta} dt + \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt \\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta - \delta\right) f(\eta) - c'\|\partial_t u - X^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}_H(t,u) - f(\eta)X_F(t,u)\|_1 - c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}|f(\eta)| - c'\|\partial_t u - X^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}_H(t,u) - f(\eta)X_F(t,u)\|_2 - c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}|f(\eta)| - c'\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u, f(\eta))\|_J - c(H,\mathfrak{m}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is the same as in Definition 2.8, $c' = c'(\mathfrak{m}, \delta) := \|\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty$. In a similar way, we get the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) &= \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt + \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u(t)) \\
&= \int_0^1 \widetilde{u}^*\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}} - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t\widetilde{u} - f(\eta)\widetilde{X}_F(t,u) - \widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)]dt \\
&\quad + f(\eta)\int_0^1 \underbrace{\lambda(u(t))[X_F(t,u)]}_{\leq\frac{3}{2}-\delta} - \underbrace{F(t,u(t))}_{\geq -\delta}dt + \int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}^{\mathfrak{m}}_H(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt \\
&\leq \left(\frac{3}{2} - \delta + \delta\right) f(\eta) + c'\|\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u) - f(\eta)X_F(t,u)\|_1 + c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}|f(\eta)| + c'\|\partial_t u - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u) - f(\eta)X_F(t,u)\|_2 + c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}|f(\eta)| + c'\|\nabla_J\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,f(\eta))\|_J + c(H,\mathfrak{m}).
\end{aligned}$$

The above two estimates prove Step 1.

Step 2 : *For any $\delta > 0$ there exist $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $(u,\eta) \in \mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R}$*

$$\|\nabla_J\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J \leq \epsilon f'(\eta)$$

then $u(t) \in U_\delta$ for all $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

By a similar argument as in Lemma 2.9 Step 2, if $F(u(t)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$ for all $t \in [0,\frac{1}{2}]$ then

$$\|\nabla_J\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J \geq \left| f'(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt\right| \geq f'(\eta)\frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Now, if there exist t_1, t_2 in $[0,\frac{1}{2}]$ with $F(u(t_1)) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $F(u(t_2)) \geq \delta$ then

$$\|\nabla_J\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J \geq \frac{\delta}{2\|\nabla F\|_\infty}.$$

If we set

$$\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta, F) := \min\left\{\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2\|\nabla F\|_\infty}\right\}$$

and use the fact that $f'(\eta) \leq 1$ for all $\eta\in\mathbb{R}$ then this proves Step 2.

By combining Step 1 and Step 2, we immediately prove the lemma. □

We need one more preparation. Now we consider a certain class of $f \in \mathcal{F}(a)$ with the following condition.

Definition 3.7. Given $a, r > 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}(a,r) := \{f \in \mathcal{F}(a) \,:\, \exists A > 0 \text{ such that } Af'(-A) > r\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Remark 3.8. Given $a > 0$, the set $\bigcap_{r>0}\mathcal{F}(a,r)$ is non-empty and path-connected. An explicit construction of $f \in \bigcap_{r>0}\mathcal{F}(a,r)$ exists. There also exists a homotopy between two different $f_0, f_1 \in \mathcal{F}(a,r)$. All these things are explained in [30, Remark 3.24, Lemma 3.25].

Proposition 3.9. *Fix $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and an action window (a,b) such that $0 < a < b < \infty$. Let $c', \epsilon > 0$ be the constants from Lemma 3.6. Choose $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{b-a}{\min\{\epsilon, a/4c'\}})$ and a generic pair $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ such that $c(H,\mathfrak{m}) \leq \frac{a}{2}$. Let $w_\pm \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $w = (u, \eta)$ be a gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with $\lim_{s\to\pm\infty} w(s) = w_\pm$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(a,b)$ satisfying $\|\eta\|_\infty \leq \kappa$.*

Proof. For convenience, set

$$\epsilon_1 := \min\left\{\epsilon, \frac{a}{4c'}\right\}.$$

First define a function $\nu_w : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ for a given gradient flow line $w = (u,\eta)$ by

$$\nu_w(l) := \inf\{\nu \geq 0 \,:\, \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(l+\nu))\|_J \leq \epsilon_1 f'(\eta(l+\nu))\}.$$

Since $\lim_{s\to\infty} f'(\eta(s)) = 1$ and $\lim_{s\to\infty} \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}((u,\eta)(s))\|_J = 0$, ν_w is well-defined. We get the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} b - a \geq& \lim_{s\to\infty} \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(s)) - \lim_{s\to-\infty} \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(s)) \\ =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(s))\|_J^2 ds \\ \geq& \int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \epsilon_1^2 f'(\eta(s))^2 ds \\ \geq& \nu_w(l)\epsilon_1^2 i_w(l)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $i_w(l) := \inf_{l \leq s \leq l+\nu_w(s)} f'(\eta(s))$. Hence we obtain

$$\nu_w(l) \leq \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1^2 i_w(l)^2}.$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \dot{\eta}(s) ds \right| \leq& \int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} |\dot{\eta}(s)|\, ds \\ \leq& \left(\nu_w(l) \int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} |\dot{\eta}(s)|^2\, ds \right)^{1/2} \\ \leq& \left(\nu_w(l) \int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(s))\|_J^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \\ \leq& (\nu_w(l)\ E(w))^{1/2} \\ \leq& \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1\ i_w(l)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

By Lemma 3.6, we get the following estimate for any $l \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} f[\eta(l+\nu_w(l))] \geq& \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}[w(l+\nu_w(l))] - c'\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)\|_J - \underbrace{c(H,\mathfrak{m})}_{\leq \frac{a}{2}}\right) \\ \geq& \frac{2}{3}(a - \underbrace{c'\epsilon_1}_{\leq \frac{a}{4}} \underbrace{f'[\eta(l+\nu_w(l))]}_{\leq 1} - \frac{a}{2}) \\ \geq& \frac{a}{6}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6})$, we get

$$\eta(l+\nu_w(l)) \geq \frac{a}{6},$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(l) \geq& \eta(l+\nu_w(l)) - \left|\int_l^{l+\nu_w(l)} \dot{\eta}(s)ds\right| \\ \geq& \frac{a}{6} - \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1 i_w(l)} \\ >& -\frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1 i_w(l)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$f'(\eta(l))\eta(l) \geq i_w(l)\eta(l) \geq -\frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1}.$$

Now suppose that there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta(l_0) < -A$ then there must be $l_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\eta(l_1) = -A$. This induces the following contradiction by the chioce of $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1})$ with (3.7),

$$-\frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1} > -f'(-A)A = f'(\eta(l_1))\eta(l_1) > -\frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1}.$$

So, we conclude that $\eta(l) > -A$ for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now consider the upper bound. Start with a new function $\widetilde{\nu}_w : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ by

$$\widetilde{\nu}_w(l) := \inf\{\nu \geq 0 : \|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w(l+\nu))\|_J \leq \epsilon_1 f'(-A)\}.$$

By a similar argument as in (3.8) and (3.9), we see that

$$\widetilde{\nu}_w(l) \leq \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1^2 \, f'(-A)^2}$$

and

$$|\eta(l) - \eta(l+\widetilde{\nu}_w(l))| < \frac{b-a}{\epsilon_1 \, f'(-A)} < A \tag{3.10}$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.7) again. By Lemma 3.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f[\eta(l+\widetilde{\nu}_w(l))] &\leq 2\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}[w(l+\widetilde{\nu}_w(l))] + c'\|\nabla_J \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}[w(l+\widetilde{\nu}_w(l))]\|_J + c(H,\mathfrak{m})\right) \\ &\leq 2(b + \underbrace{c'\epsilon_1}_{\leq \frac{a}{4}} \underbrace{f'(-A)}_{\leq 1} + \frac{a}{2}) \\ &< 2a + 2b. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\eta(l+\widetilde{\nu}_w(l))<2a+2b$ and by (3.10)

$$\eta(l)<2a+2b+A.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\|\eta\|_\infty<\kappa:=2a+2b+A.$$

$\square$

For simplicity, let us denote by

$$A(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}):=\{\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(w)\,:\,w\in\mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})\}.$$

Theorem 3.10. *Fix* $F\in\mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ *and* $f\in\bigcap_{r>0}\mathcal{F}(\frac{1}{6},r)$*, see Definition 3.7. Choose a generic pair* $(H,\mathfrak{m})$*. If* $\max\{1,2\,c(H,\mathfrak{m})\}<a<b\leq\infty$ *and* $a,b\notin A(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$*, then* $\mathrm{FH}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ *is well-defined.*

The construction of $\mathrm{FH}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ is the same as in the $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$-case. For $w=(u,\eta)\in\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_m)$, we define the index $\mu(w):=\mu_{\mathrm{CZ}}(u)$. Let us denote by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}_k(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})&:=\{w\in\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_m)\,:\,\mu(w)=k\};\\ \mathrm{FC}^{(a,b)}_k(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})&:=\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}_k(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})\otimes\mathbb{Z}_2.\end{aligned}$$

For a generic almost complex structure $J(t)\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and given $w_\pm\in\mathrm{Crit}^{(a,b)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(w_-,w_+)&:=\{w(s)\,:\,w\text{ satisfies (3.5)},\ \lim_{s\to\pm\infty}w(s)=w_\pm\};\\ \mathcal{M}(w_-,w_+)&:=\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(w_-,w_+)/\mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

The above $\mathbb{R}$-action is given by translating the s-coordinate. Suppose further that the almost complex structure $J(t)$ is generic, so that $\mathcal{M}(w_-,w_+)$ is a smooth manifold of dimension

$$\dim\mathcal{M}(w_-,w_+)=\mu(w_-)-\mu(w_+)-1.$$

The boundary operator $\partial:\mathrm{FC}^{(a,b)}_k(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})\to\mathrm{FC}^{(a,b)}_{k-1}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ is defined by

$$\partial w_-:=\sum_{\mu(w_+)=k-1}\#_2\mathcal{M}(w_-,w_+)w_+,$$

where $\#_2$ means $\mathbb{Z}_2$-counting. By virtue of Proposition 3.9 with Theorem 2.7, ∂ satisfies $\partial\circ\partial=0$. Then the resulting filtered Floer homology group is

$$\mathrm{FH}^{(a,b)}_*(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})=\mathrm{H}_*(\mathrm{FC}^{(a,b)}_\bullet(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}),\partial).$$

3.4. **Continuation map between** $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}^f)$ **and** $\mathrm{FH}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

In this section we construct a continuation homomorphism between $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}^f)$ and $\mathrm{FC}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ which induces a map on homologies on a suitable action window. The construction is given by counting gradient flow lines of the s-dependent action functional

$$\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta):=\mathcal{A}^f(u,\eta)+\gamma(s)\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u).$$

Here $\mathcal{A}^f(u,\eta) = \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - f(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt$ and $\mathfrak{m}(s)$ is defined in (2.8). With the same metric as in (2.9), the gradient flow line $w=(u,\eta)\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times S^1, T^*N)\times C^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \partial_s u + J(s,t,u)\big(\partial_t u - f(\eta)X_F(t,u) - X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)\big) = 0 \\ \partial_s \eta + f'(\eta)\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt = 0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{3.11}$$

In order to construct a continuation map, we need to check that the energy $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\|\partial_s w\|_s^2 ds$ and the Lagrange multiplier η of gradient flow lines w are uniformly bounded. As in the $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ case, we start with the fundamental lemma.

Lemma 3.11. There exist $\overline{\epsilon}, \overline{c}\,' > 0$ such that if $(u,\eta)\in\mathcal{L}\times\mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla_s \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s \le \overline{\epsilon} f'(\eta)$$

then

$$\frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta) - \overline{c}\,'\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s - \overline{c}\right) \le f(\eta) \le 2\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta) + \overline{c}\,'\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s + \overline{c}\right).$$

Here

$$\overline{c} = \overline{c}(H,\mathfrak{m}) := \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}}\sup_{(t,u)\in S^1\times\mathcal{L}}\left|\int_0^1 \widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(\widetilde{u}(t))[\widetilde{X}_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(t,u)] - H(t,u(t))dt\right|.$$

Proof. The proof is similar as in Lemma 3.6 with $\mathfrak{m}(s)$ instead of $\mathfrak{m}$. So we omit the proof. With a simple computation, one checks that

$$\overline{\epsilon} = \overline{\epsilon}(\delta,F) := \min\left\{\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2\|\nabla F\|_\infty}\right\}$$

and

$$\overline{c}\,' = \overline{c}\,'(\mathfrak{m},\delta) := \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}}\|\widetilde{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}|_{\widetilde{U}_\delta}\|_\infty.$$

Here δ is chosen satisfying

$$\frac{1}{2}+\delta \le \lambda(X_F(p)) \le \frac{3}{2}-\delta, \quad \forall p\in U_\delta.$$

□

Proposition 3.12. *Fix $F\in\mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and an action window $(a,2a)$ such that $a\ge 2$. Let $\overline{c}\,', \overline{\epsilon} > 0$ be the constants from Lemma 3.11. Choose $f\in\mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{2a+1}{\min\{\overline{\epsilon}, a/8\overline{c}\,'\}})$ and a generic pair $(H,\mathfrak{m})$ such that $c(H,\mathfrak{m})\le\frac{a}{2}$. Let w be a gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ with the following asymptotic conditions*

$$\lim_{s\to-\infty} w(s) = w_- \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}), \quad \lim_{s\to\infty} w(s) = w_+ \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}).$$

If $\|\beta\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small then the L^∞-norm of η is uniformly bounded in terms of a constant which only depends on w_-, w_+.

Proof. The proof consists of 4 steps.

Step 1 : *The energy is bounded by $\|f(\eta)\|_\infty$.*

By a similar argument as in Proposition 2.14 Step 1, we obtain

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\right| ds \le 2CE(w) + 2C + 2d_\mathfrak{m}C + 2\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F C \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$E(w) \leq 2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F C, \tag{3.13}$$

under the smallness condition on the isoperimetric constant

$$C < \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.14}$$

For convenience, we summarize the notations as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E(w) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|\partial_s w(s)\|_s^2 ds; \\ C &= \|\beta\|_\infty \|\theta\|_\infty; \\ d_{\mathfrak{m}} &= d_{H,\mathfrak{m}} = \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} \|X_H^{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\|_\infty; \\ d_F &= \|X_F\|_\infty; \\ \Delta &= \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-). \end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ with small norm $\|\beta\|_\infty$ then we may assume that C is sufficiently small. The smallness of C is important in the following steps.

Step 2 : *$\eta(s)$ is uniformly bounded from above.*

In this step, without loss of generality, we work on the region that $\eta(s) \geq \frac{a}{6}$. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6})$, $f(\eta(s)) = \eta(s)$ and $f'(\eta(s)) = 1$. Then Lemma 3.11 implies the following:
There exist $\overline{\epsilon}, \overline{c}, \overline{c}' > 0$ such that if $(u, \eta) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\|\nabla_s \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s \leq \overline{\epsilon} = \overline{\epsilon}\,\underbrace{f'(\eta)}_{=1}$$

then

$$f(\eta) \leq 2\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta) + \overline{c}'\|\nabla_s \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(u,\eta)\|_s + \overline{c}\right), \tag{3.15}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\eta(s) \geq \frac{a}{6}$. Here $\overline{\epsilon}, \overline{c}, \overline{c}' > 0$ come from Lemma 3.11.

Now define

$$\overline{\nu}_w(l) := \inf\{\overline{\nu} \geq 0 : \|\nabla_s \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(l+\overline{\nu})}(w(l+\overline{\nu}))\|_s < \overline{\epsilon}\},$$

for $l \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta(l) \geq \frac{a}{6}$. Then by a similar argument as in (2.17), we obtain the following estimate

$$\overline{\nu}_w(l) \leq \frac{E(w)}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}. \tag{3.16}$$

By the gradient flow equation (3.11) and (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_l^{l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)} \partial_s f(\eta(s))ds\right| &\le \left|\int_l^{l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)} \underbrace{f'(\eta(s))}_{\le 1}\partial_s\eta(s)ds\right|\\ &\le \left|\int_l^{l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)} \partial_s\eta(s)ds\right|\\ &= \left|\int_l^{l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)} \underbrace{f'(\eta(s))}_{\le 1}\underbrace{\int_0^1 F(t,u)dt}_{\le\|F\|_\infty}\, ds\right|\\ &\le \|F\|_\infty\overline{\nu}_w(l)\\ &\le \|F\|_\infty\frac{E(w)}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

Let us note that the following inequality holds for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$

$$a-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\right|ds \le \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) \le 2a+\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\right|ds.\tag{3.18}$$

By the definition of $\overline{\nu}_w(l)$ and the above estimates (3.15), (3.18) and (3.12) we get

$$\begin{aligned}f[\eta(l+\overline{\nu}_w(l))] \le& 2\Bigg(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\overline{\nu}_w(l))]+\overline{c}\,'\underbrace{\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\overline{\nu}_w(l))]\|_s}_{\le\overline{\epsilon}}+\overline{c}\Bigg)\\ \le& 2\left(2a+\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))|ds+\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\right)\\ \le& 2\left(2a+2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F C+\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

Now combine (3.17) and (3.19), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}f(\eta(l)) \le& f[\eta(l+\overline{\nu}_w(l))]+\left|\int_l^{l+\overline{\nu}_w(l)}\partial_s f(\eta(s))ds\right|\\ \le& 2\left(2a+2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F C+\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\right)+\|F\|_\infty\frac{E(w)}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}\\ \le& \left(16Cd_F+4d_F+\frac{4\|F\|_\infty d_F}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}\right)C\|f(\eta)\|_\infty\\ &+4a+8C\Delta+16C^2+16C^2d_{\mathfrak{m}}+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon}+2\overline{c}\\ &+\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C),\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

where for the last inequality we use (3.13). Note that the last line of the above estimate (3.20) does not depend on the choice of a gradient flow line w and $l\in\mathbb{R}$. If we choose a sufficiently small $C>0$ such that

$$\left(16\,d_F\,C+4\,d_F+\frac{4\|F\|_\infty d_F}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}\right)C\le\frac{1}{2}\tag{3.21}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\eta)\|_\infty \leq & 2\Big(4a+8C\Delta+16C^2+16C^2d_{\mathfrak{m}}+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon}+2\overline{c}\\ & +\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2\Delta+4C+4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Big)=:\overline{\kappa}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

Since $f(\eta(s))=\eta(s)$ for $s\geq\frac{a}{6}$, this implies that $\overline{\kappa}$ is an uniform upper bound of $\eta(s)$.

Step 3 : *If* $\|\beta\|_\infty$ *is sufficiently small then* $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|\dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))|ds\leq\frac{a}{8}$.

The above estimates (3.12), (3.13), (3.22) and $\Delta<a$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\right|ds \leq & 2CE(w)+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+2\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_FC\\ \leq & (8d_FC^2+2d_FC)\|f(\eta)\|_\infty+4aC+8C^2+8d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C\\ \leq & 8(4d_FC^2+d_FC)\Big(2a+4aC+8C^2+8C^2d_{\mathfrak{m}}+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\\ & +\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(a+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Big)+4aC+8C^2+8d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C\\ = & \Big(8(4d_FC^2+d_FC)(2+4C+\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2})+4C\Big)a\\ & +8(4d_FC^2+d_FC)\Big(8C^2+8C^2d_{\mathfrak{m}}+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\\ & +\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Big)+8C^2+8d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C.\end{aligned}$$

If we choose a sufficiently small isoperimetric constant $C>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}8(4d_FC^2+d_FC)(2+4C+\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2})+4C\leq\frac{1}{16};\\ 8(4d_FC^2+d_FC)\Big(8C^2+8C^2d_{\mathfrak{m}}+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C+\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon}+\overline{c}\\ +\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Big)+8C^2+8d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2+2C+2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C\leq\frac{1}{8},\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

then we get the following estimate

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}\right|ds\leq\frac{a}{16}+\frac{1}{8}\leq\frac{a}{8},$$

where for the last inequality we use $a\geq 2$. This proves Step 3.

Step 4 : $\eta(s)$ *is uniformly bounded.*

First set

$$\underline{\epsilon}:=\min\left\{\overline{\epsilon},\frac{a}{8\overline{c}'}\right\},$$

and define a function $\underline{\nu}_w:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ by

$$\underline{\nu}_w(l):=\inf\{\underline{\nu}\geq 0:\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(l+\underline{\nu})}(w(l+\underline{\nu}))\|_s<\underline{\epsilon}\,f'(\eta(l+\underline{\nu}))\}.$$

Now set

$$\underline{i}_w(l) := \inf_{l\le s\le l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)} f'(\eta(s)).$$

By similar arguments as in (3.8) and (3.9), we obtain the following estimates

$$\underline{\nu}_w(l) \le \frac{E(w)}{\underline{\epsilon}^2\, \underline{i}_w(l)^2}$$

and

$$|\eta(l) - \eta(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))| \le \frac{E(w)}{\underline{\epsilon}\, \underline{i}_w(l)}.$$

By the definition of $\underline{\nu}_w$, Lemma 3.11 implies that for any $l \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} f[\eta(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] \ge& \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] - \overline{c}'\|\nabla_s\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))]\|_s - \overline{c}\right)\\ \ge& \frac{2}{3}\Bigg(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] - \underbrace{\overline{c}'\underline{\epsilon}}_{\le\frac{a}{8}}\,\underbrace{f'[\eta(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))]}_{\le 1} - \frac{a}{2}\Bigg) \\ \ge& \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] - \frac{5}{8}a\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

The action estimate (3.18) and Step 3 give us the following estimate

$$\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s)) \ge a - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\dot{\mathcal{A}}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}(w(s))\right| ds \ge \frac{7}{8}a. \tag{3.25}$$

Let us combine (3.24), (3.25) to obtain

$$f[\eta(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] \ge \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}[l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)]}[w(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l))] - \frac{5}{8}a\right) \ge \frac{a}{6}.$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6})$,

$$\eta(l+\underline{\nu}_w(l)) \ge \frac{a}{6} > 0,$$

and hence

$$\eta(l) \ge \frac{a}{6} - \frac{E(w)}{\underline{\epsilon}\, \underline{i}_w(l)} \ge -\frac{E(w)}{\underline{\epsilon}\, \underline{i}_w(l)}.$$

As a consequence,

$$-f'(\eta(l))\eta(l) \le -\underline{i}_w(l)\eta(l) \le \frac{E(w)}{\underline{\epsilon}} \le \frac{1}{\underline{\epsilon}}(2\Delta + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\overline{\kappa}d_F C),$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.13) and (3.22). If we choose C sufficiently small such that

$$(4 + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 4\overline{\kappa}d_F)C \le 1, \tag{3.26}$$

then

$$-f'(\eta(l))\eta(l) \le \frac{2a+1}{\underline{\epsilon}},$$

here we use again $\Delta < a$. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{2a+1}{\underline{\epsilon}})$, there exists $A > 0$ such that

$$Af'(-A) > \frac{2a+1}{\underline{\epsilon}}.$$

Now suppose that there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta(l_0) < -A$ then by continuity there exists $l_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta(l_1) = -A$ which leads to a contradiction via condition (3.7)

$$\frac{2a+1}{\underline{\epsilon}} < f'(-A)A = -f'(\eta(l_1))\eta(l_1) < \frac{2a+1}{\underline{\epsilon}}.$$

Thus we conclude that $\eta(l) > -A$ for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence

$$\|\eta(l)\|_\infty \leq \kappa := \max\{\overline{\kappa}, A\}.$$

□

Lemma 3.13. Fix $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and an action window $(a, 2a)$ such that $a \geq 2$. Let $\overline{c}', \overline{\epsilon} > 0$ be the constants from Lemma 3.11. Choose $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{2a+1}{\min\{\overline{\epsilon}, a/8\overline{c}'\}})$ and a generic pair $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ such that $c(H, \mathfrak{m}) \leq \frac{a}{2}$. Let w be a gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ with the following asymptotic conditions:

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} w(s) = w_- \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}), \quad \lim_{s \to \infty} w(s) = w_+ \in \mathrm{Crit}^{(a,2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}).$$

If $\|\beta\|_\infty$ is sufficiently small, then

$$\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) \geq \frac{9}{10}\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) - \frac{1}{10}.$$

Proof. For notational simplicity, Let us denote by

$$p = \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-), \quad q = \mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+).$$

By Step 2 in Proposition 3.12, $f(\eta)$ is uniformly bounded as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\eta)\|_\infty \leq & 2\Big(2q + 8C(q-p) + 16C^2 + 16C^2 d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 2\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon} + 2\overline{c} \\ & + \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2(q-p) + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Since $E(w) \geq 0$, we obtain the following inequality from (3.13)

$$q \geq p - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 2\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F C.$$

By taking a small isoperimetric constant $C > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} 8d_F\left(\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}} + 4C + 1\right)C \leq \frac{1}{9}; \\ 2\Big(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 8d_F\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}C + 8d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}\frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}C \\ +32d_F C^2 + 32d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2 + 8d_F C + 8d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\overline{c}'\overline{\epsilon}d_F + 4\overline{c}d_F\Big)C \leq \frac{1}{9}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

we now get

$$\begin{aligned}
q \geq & p - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 2\|f(\eta)\|_{\infty} d_F C \\
\geq & p - 2C - 2d_{\mathfrak{m}}C - 4d_F C\bigg(\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}(2(q-p) + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C) \\
& + 2q + 8C(q-p) + 16C^2 + 16C^2 d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 4C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 2\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon} + 2\overline{c}\bigg) \\
= & p + 8d_F\left(\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}^2} + 4C\right) C\, p - 8d_F\left(\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}} + 4C + 1\right) C\, q - 2\bigg(1 + d_{\mathfrak{m}} + 8d_F\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}C \\
& + 8d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}^2}C + 32d_F C^2 + 32d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}C^2 + 8d_F C + 8d_F d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\overline{c}\,'\overline{\epsilon}d_F + 4\overline{c}d_F\bigg)C \\
\geq & p + \underbrace{8d_F\left(\frac{\|F\|_{\infty}}{\overline{\epsilon}^2} + 4C\right) C}_{\geq 0}\, p - \frac{1}{9}q - \frac{1}{9} \\
\geq & p - \frac{1}{9}q - \frac{1}{9}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion. □

For convenience, let us abbreviate

$$h[p] := \frac{9}{10}p - \frac{1}{10}.$$

Lemma 3.14. Fix $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and an action window $(a, 2a)$ such that $a \geq 2$. Let $\overline{c}\,', \overline{\epsilon} > 0$ be the constants from Lemma 3.11. Choose $f \in \mathcal{F}(\frac{a}{6}, \frac{2a+1}{\min\{\overline{\epsilon}, a/8\overline{c}\,'\}})$ and a generic pair $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ such that $c(H, \mathfrak{m}) \leq \frac{a}{2}$. If $\|\beta\|_{\infty}$ is sufficiently small then there exists a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}) \arrow[rr, "i(h^{-2}[a]{,}h^2[2a])"] \arrow[dr, "\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathfrak{m}}"'] & & \mathrm{FH}^{(a,h^2[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}) \\
& \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}) \arrow[ur, "\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{m}}"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. Let us first construct $\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathfrak{m}}$. Let w be the gradient flow line of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ satisfying the limit conditions:

$$\lim_{s\to-\infty} w(s) = w_- \in \mathrm{Crit}_k^{(h^{-2}[a],2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}), \qquad \lim_{s\to\infty} w(s) = w_+ \in \mathrm{Crit}_k^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}). \tag{3.28}$$

Let $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}}(w_-, w_+)$ be the set of such gradient flow lines. If $\mu(w_-) = \mu(w_+)$, then we may assume that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}}(w_-, w_+)$ is discrete for a generic almost complex structure $J(s,t) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$. We now define a map

$$\Phi^{\mathfrak{m}}_* : \mathrm{FC}_*(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}) \to \mathrm{FC}_*(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)})$$

given by

$$\Phi^{\mathfrak{m}}(w_-) = \sum_{\mu(w_+)=\mu(w_-)} \#_2\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}}(w_-, w_+)w_+.$$

Since $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$ is symplectically aspherical for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there is no bubbling. In order to compactify the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{m}}(w_-, w_+)$, it suffices to bound the energy $E(w) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|w\|_s^2 ds$ and the Lagrange multiplier η in terms of w_-, w_+. Since $\|\beta\|_\infty$ is small, we may choose a sufficiently small isoperimetric constant C satisfying (3.14), (3.21), (3.23), (3.26). Now we can use the argument of Proposition 3.12. Especially (3.13), (3.22) give us the following uniform energy bound

$$\begin{aligned} E(w) \leq & 2\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - 2\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) + 4\,C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\|f(\eta)\|_\infty d_F\,C \\ \leq & 2\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}(w_+) - 2\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}(w_-) + 4\,C + 4d_{\mathfrak{m}}C + 4\,\overline{\kappa}(w_-, w_+)\,d_F\,C \end{aligned}$$

and Proposition 3.12 enables us to conclude that the Lagrange multiplier η is also uniformly bounded. Let us choose a smaller $\|\beta\|_\infty$ such that the isoperimetric constant C satisfy (3.27) additionally. By virtue of Lemma 3.13, we obtain the following map.

$$\Phi^{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FC}^{(h^{-2}[a],2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}) \to \mathrm{FC}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}).$$

Since the continuation map $\Phi^{\mathfrak{m}}$ commutes with the boundary operators, this induces the following homomorphism on homologies as follows

$$\widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],2a)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}) \to \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}).$$

Now we consider the inverse homotopy of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(s)}$. By modifying the above construction, we obtain

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(1)}) \to \mathrm{FH}^{(a,h^2[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)}).$$

By a homotopy-of homotopies argument, we conclude that $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{m}} \circ \widetilde{\Phi}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ is the identity map on $\mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],h^2[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}(0)})$. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 3.15. *Fix $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and $f \in \bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{F}(\frac{1}{6}, r)$, see Definition 3.7. If $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ is a generic pair with sufficiently small $\|\beta\|_\infty$, then*

$$\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],h^2[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f) \tag{3.29}$$

also holds for generic a, T such that $\max\{2, 2c(H,\mathfrak{m})\} < a < T < \infty$.

Proof. By the commutative diagram in Lemma 3.14, we obtain the following dimension estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &\geq \operatorname{rank}\big(i(h^{-2}[a], h^2[2a])\big) \\ &\geq \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],h^2[2a])}(\mathcal{A}^f). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Actually if we choose $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b < 2a$ then

$$\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[b])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \geq \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],h^2[b])}(\mathcal{A}^f)$$

holds under the generic condition $h[b] \notin A(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $h^2[b] \notin A(\mathcal{A}^f)$.

Now we construct a sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that the following holds:

- $a_1 \geq \max\{2, 2c(H, \mathfrak{m})\}$;
- $a_{i+1} = h^2[2a_i]$;
- $h^{-1}[a_i] \notin A(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}),\ \forall\, i \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $h^{-2}[a_i], h^2[2a_i] \notin A(\mathcal{A}^f),\ \forall\, i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note that a_1 determines the sequence and obviously $\{a_i\}$ is strictly increasing. The 3rd and 4th conditions are guaranteed for a generic a_1. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the set of sequences satisfying the above conditions.

In order to compare $\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a],h[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}})$ and $\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a],h^2[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f)$, we use (3.30) inductively. Choose $\{a_i\} \in \mathfrak{a}$ then the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}(a_1),h(2a_k))}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a_i],h[2a_i])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a_i],h^2[2a_i])}(\mathcal{A}^f).\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

But there exist missing action intervals for $\mathcal{A}^f$ in the last term of (3.31). To cover the missing intervals, we first observe that if $a \geq 2$ then the length of the action intervals for $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^f$

$$h[2a] - h^{-1}[a], \quad h^2[2a] - h^{-2}[a]$$

are positive and increasing functions with respect to a. By a simple computation, one can check that its ratio satisfies

$$\frac{h[2a] - h^{-1}[a]}{h^2[2a] - h^{-2}[a]} \leq 4$$

for all $a \geq 2$. This implies that there exist 4 sequences $\{a^1_i\}, \{a^2_i\}, \{a^3_i\}, \{a^4_i\} \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that $a^1_1 < a^2_1 < a^3_1 < a^4_1 < a^1_2$ and

$$\left(h^{-2}[a^1_k], h^2[2a^1_k]\right) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{4} \left(h^{-2}[a^j_i], h^2[2a^j_i]\right)$$

covers $(h^{-2}[a^1_1], h^2[2a^1_k]) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now we obtain the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}4 \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a^1_1],h[2a^1_k])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{4} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a^j_i],h[2a^j_i])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) + \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a^1_k],h[2a^1_k])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{4} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a^j_i],h^2[2a^j_i])}(\mathcal{A}^f) + \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a^1_k],h^2[2a^1_k])}(\mathcal{A}^f) \\ &\geq \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-2}[a^1_1],h^2[2a^1_k])}(\mathcal{A}^f).\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

□

Proposition 3.16. *Fix* $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ *and* $f \in \bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{F}(\frac{1}{6}, r)$. *Let* $\overline{c}\,', \overline{\epsilon} > 0$ *be the constants from Lemma 3.11. If* $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ *is generic then there exist*

$$n = n(N, g, F, \overline{c}\,', \overline{\epsilon}, H, \mathfrak{m}) \in \mathbb{N}$$

such that

$$\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(a,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \geq \frac{1}{4^n} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n}[a],h^n[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f)$$

holds for generic a, T *such that* $\max\{h^{-1}[2], h^{-1}[2c(H,\mathfrak{m})]\} < a < T < \infty$.

Proof. In order to use Lemma 3.15, we first subdivide $\mathfrak{m}$ into small pieces to have the following properties:

- $\mathfrak{m}^i = (d^i\beta, \sigma, \theta)$, where $0 = d^0 < d^1 < \cdots < d^n = 1$;
- $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^i} : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Morse for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$;
- $C^i = (d^{i+1} - d^i)\|\beta\|_\infty \|\sigma\|_\infty$ satisfies (3.14), (3.21), (3.23) and (3.27) for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$.

By the choice of f, it is not necessary for the isoperimetric constant C to satisfy the condition (3.26). This implies that the *subdivision number* n for $\mathfrak{m}$ does not depend on the action window. Now choose a, T such that the following conditions hold:

- $\max\{h^{-1}[2], h^{-1}[2c(H,\mathfrak{m})]\} < a < T < \infty$;
- $h^{-n+i}[a], h^{n-i}[T] \notin A(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^i})$ $\forall i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

By the above second condition, $\mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n+i}[a], h^{n-i}[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^i})$ are well-defined for $0 \le i \le n$. Now we are ready to apply Lemma 3.15. If we use (3.29) inductively then we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(a,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) &= \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(a,T)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^n}) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{4} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-1}[a], h[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^{n-1}}) \\
&\ge \cdots \\
&\ge \frac{1}{4^n} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n}[a], h^n[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}^0}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4^n} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n}[a], h^n[T])}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Remark 3.17. The argument in Proposition 3.16 holds for any $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$ and any generic $(H, \mathfrak{m})$. Note $\overline{c}', \overline{\epsilon}$ depend on F and a $\delta-$neighborhood of $F^{-1}(0)$. For a given diffeomorphism $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathrm{Diff}(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$, consider all defining data $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ for $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ such that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} = \phi^1_{X^{\mathfrak{m}}_H}$. Now we consider

$$n' := \inf_{(H,\mathfrak{m})} \inf_{(F,\delta)} n(N, g, F, \overline{c}', \overline{\epsilon}, H, \mathfrak{m})$$

then n' depends only on $(N, g, \Sigma, \varphi_{\mathfrak{m}})$. By abuse of notation, we write $n = n'$.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We first fix a defining Hamiltonian F for Σ and a defining data $(H, \mathfrak{m})$ for $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Choose $f \in \bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{F}(\frac{1}{6}, r)$. By the generic assumption, $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ has no periodic leaf-wise intersection point and $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse for the action window $\left(\frac{1}{6} + c(H,\mathfrak{m}), \infty\right]$, see Corollary A.4.

If we choose a generic action value a, T such that $\max\{h^{-1}[2], h^{-1}[2c(H,\mathfrak{m})]\} < a < T < \infty$ then Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.16 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(T) &\ge \#\mathrm{Crit}^{\left(\frac{1}{6}+c(H,\mathfrak{m}), T-c(H,\mathfrak{m})\right)}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\
&\ge \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(a, T-c(H,\mathfrak{m}))}(\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{4^n} \dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n}[a], h^n[T-c(H,\mathfrak{m})])}(\mathcal{A}^f).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Here $n = n(N, g, \Sigma, \varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the constant from Proposition 3.16 with Remark 3.17.

Now we recall that $\mathcal{L}_N$ is the free loop space of (N,g). The energy functional $\mathcal{E}_g : \mathcal{L}_N \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_g(q) := \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2}|\dot{q}|_g^2 dt.$$

For given $0 < T < \infty$, denote by

$$\mathcal{L}_N(T) := \Big\{ q \in \mathcal{L}_N \, : \, \mathcal{E}_g(q) \leq \frac{1}{2}T^2 \Big\}.$$

By the result of Macarini-Merry-Paternain [30, Proof of Theorem A, Remark 1.4], there exists a constant $c' = c'(N,g,\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}) > 0$ such that

$$\dim \mathrm{FH}^{(h^{-n}[a],h^n[T-c(H,\mathfrak{m})])}(\mathcal{A}^f) \geq \operatorname{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_*\big(\mathcal{L}_N(c'(T-1))\big) \to \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N)\}.$$

If $c := \min\{\frac{1}{4^n}, c'\} > 0$ then finally we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\Sigma,\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}}(T) \geq & \frac{1}{4^n}\operatorname{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_*\big(\mathcal{L}_N(c'(T-1))\big) \to \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N)\} \\ \geq & c \cdot \operatorname{rank}\{\iota : \mathrm{H}_*\big(\mathcal{L}_N(c(T-1))\big) \to \mathrm{H}_*(\mathcal{L}_N)\}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the theorem. □

Appendix A. The perturbed Rabinowitz action functional is generically Morse.

In this section we study the Morse property of the perturbed Rabinowitz action functional. Note first that the action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathcal{A}^F_{H,\mathfrak{m}}$ is determined by the following data $F \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$, $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M}$. Especially $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M}$ consist of (β, σ, θ), see Definition 1.1. We claim that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse for generic $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$. The generic property for $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is well-studied in [4, Appendix A]. So we concentrate on the Morse property of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with respect to the case of $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$. First recall that

$$\mathfrak{B} := \{\beta \in C^\infty(S^1) \, : \, \beta(t) = 0, \ \forall t \in [0,1/2]\}.$$

Theorem A.1. *For a generic $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ the perturbed Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse.*

A.1. **Preparations.** The proof of the genericity of the Morse property follows a standard method, that is, once it is shown that a certain linear operator is surjective then the theorem follows from Sard-Smale's theorem. In this proof we follow the strategy of [4, Appendix A].

First, let us recall the definition of the perturbed Rabinowitz action functional

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \\ &(u,\eta) \mapsto \int_0^1 u^*\lambda - \eta \int_0^1 F(t,u(t))dt - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt + \int_0^1 \tau^*\beta(t)\theta(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u}(t)]dt \end{aligned}$$

where in this section, from now on $\mathcal{L} \equiv W^{(1,2)}(S^1, T^*N)$ is the completed loop space of T^*N. For convenience we abbreviate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{L} &\to \mathbb{R} \\ u &\mapsto \int_0^1 F(t,u)dt, \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}} = \underline{\mathcal{A}}_{H,\mathfrak{m}} := \int_0^1 \lambda(u(t))[\partial_t u] - \int_0^1 H(t,u(t))dt + \int_0^1 \beta(t)\theta(\widetilde{u}(t))[\partial_t \widetilde{u}(t)]dt$$

and

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F} := \underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u) - \eta\mathcal{F}(u)$. We note that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta) = \underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}(u) + (\eta_0-\eta)\mathcal{F}(u)$, and therefore

$$d\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u,\eta)[\hat{u},\hat{\eta}] = d\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}(u)[\hat{u}] - \hat{\eta}\mathcal{F}(u) + (\eta_0-\eta)d\mathcal{F}(u)[\hat{u}]$$

where $\hat{u} \in \Gamma^{1,2}(u^*T(T^*N))$, the space of $W^{1,2}$ vector fields along u and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence at a critical point $w_0 = (u_0,\eta_0) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ the Hessian equals

$$\mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}}(w_0)[(\hat{u}_1,\hat{\eta}_1),(\hat{u}_2,\hat{\eta}_2)] = \mathscr{H}_{\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}}(u_0)[\hat{u}_1,\hat{u}_2] - \hat{\eta}_1 d\mathcal{F}(u_0)[\hat{u}_2] - \hat{\eta}_2 d\mathcal{F}(u_0)[\hat{u}_1].$$

For a function $P : [0,1]\times T^*N \to \mathbb{R}$, an S^1-parameterized symplectic form $\omega_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and the corresponding $\phi^1_{X_P^{\mathfrak{m}}} \in \mathrm{Diff}(T^*N,\mathfrak{m})$, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_{P,\mathfrak{m}} := \{v \in W^{1,2}([0,1],T^*N) \,:\, v(0) = \phi^1_{X_P^{\mathfrak{m}}}(v(1))\}, \tag{A.1}$$

the twisted loop space, and introduce the diffeomorphism $\Phi_{P,\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{L}_{P,\mathfrak{m}} \to \mathcal{L}$

$$\Phi_{P,\mathfrak{m}}(v)(t) = \phi^t_{X_P^{\mathfrak{m}}}(v(t)).$$

For a fixed critical point $w_0 = (u_0,\eta_0)$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ we use this diffeomorphism to pull back $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F} := (\Phi_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}})^*\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{L}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}.$$

We set $v_0 := \Phi^{-1}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}} \circ u_0$, thus $v_0 = \mathrm{const}$. Then using

$$(\Phi^*_{H,\mathfrak{m}} d\underline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}})(v)[\hat{v}] = \int_0^1 \omega(\partial_t v(t),\hat{v}(t))dt$$

we obtain

$$\mathscr{H}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}}(v_0,\eta_0)[(\hat{v}_1,\hat{\eta}_1),(\hat{v}_2,\hat{\eta}_2)] = \int_0^1 \omega(\partial_t\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)dt - \hat{\eta}_1 d\overline{\mathcal{F}}(v_0)[\hat{v}_2] - \hat{\eta}_2 d\overline{\mathcal{F}}(v_0)[\hat{v}_1],$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F} \circ \Phi_{\eta_0 F+H,\sigma\beta}$. Since $F(t,x) = 0$ for $t \in [\frac{1}{2},1]$ and $H(t,x), \beta(t)$ vanish for $t \in [0,\frac{1}{2}]$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{F}}(v) &= \int_0^1 F(t,\varphi^t_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}(v))dt = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} F(t,\varphi^t_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}(v))dt\\ &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} F(t,\varphi^t_{\eta_0 F}(v))dt = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} F(t,v)dt\\ &= \int_0^1 F(t,v)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Hessian of $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}$ simplifies as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{H}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}}(v_0,\eta_0)[(\hat{v}_1,\hat{\eta}_1),(\hat{v}_2,\hat{\eta}_2)]\\ &\qquad = \int_0^1 \omega(\partial_t\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)dt - \hat{\eta}_1\int_0^1 dF(t,v_0)[\hat{v}_2]dt - \hat{\eta}_2\int_0^1 dF(t,v_0)[\hat{v}_1]dt\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

A.2. **The linearized operator.** We denote by $\mathfrak{B}^k = \{\beta \in C^k(S^1) \,:\, \beta(t) = 0,\ \forall t \in [0, 1/2]\}$. For $v \in \mathcal{L}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}$ (see equation (A.1) for the definition) we define the bundle $\mathcal{E}_{H,\mathfrak{m}} \to \mathcal{L}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}$ by

$$(\mathcal{E}_{H,\mathfrak{m}})_v := L^2([0,1], v^*T(T^*N)).$$

Definition A.2. Let (u_0, η_0) be a critical point of $\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{m}$ and (v_0, η_0) the corresponding critical point of $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_\mathfrak{m}^{\eta_0 F}$, that is the point defined by the equation $u_0 = \Phi_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}(v_0)$. Then we define the linear operator

$$L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)} : (T_{v_0}\mathcal{L}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{B}^k \to (\mathcal{E}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}})^\vee \times \mathbb{R}$$

via the pairing with $(\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2) \in (\mathcal{E}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}) \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}[\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\beta}], (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2)\rangle \\ &\quad := \mathscr{H}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}_\mathfrak{m}^{\eta_0 F}}(v_0, \eta_0)[(\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1), (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2)] + \int_0^1 \hat{\beta}(t)\sigma(\tau_*\partial_t \hat{v}_1(t), \tau_* \hat{v}_2(t))dt\end{aligned}$$

Proposition A.3. *The operator $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ is surjective. In fact, $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ is surjective when restricted to the space*

$$\mathcal{V} := \{(\hat{v}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\beta}) \in (T_{v_0}\mathcal{L}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{B}^k \,:\, \hat{v}(\tfrac{1}{2}) = 0\}.$$

Proof. The L^2-Hessian is a self-adjoint operator. Thus, the operator $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ has closed image. Therefore, it suffices to prove that the annihilator of the image of $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ vanishes. Let $(\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2)$ be in the annihilator of the image of $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$, that is

$$\langle L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}[\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\beta}], (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2)\rangle = 0$$

for all $(\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1, \hat{\beta}) \in (T_{v_0}\mathcal{L}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{B}^k$. This is equivalent to the following two equations:

$$\mathscr{H}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}_\mathfrak{m}^{\eta_0 F}}(v_0, \eta_0)[(\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1), (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\eta}_2)] = 0, \quad \forall (\hat{v}_1, \hat{\eta}_1) \in (T_{v_0}\mathcal{L}_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}) \times \mathbb{R} \tag{A.3}$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \hat{\beta}(t)\sigma(\tau_*\partial_t \hat{v}_1(t), \tau_* \hat{v}_2(t))dt = 0, \quad \forall \hat{\beta} \in \mathfrak{B}^k. \tag{A.4}$$

Since the Hessian $\mathscr{H}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}_\mathfrak{m}^{\eta_0 F}}$ is a self-adjoint operator, equation (A.2) and (A.3) imply by elliptic regularity that $\hat{v}_2 \in C^{k+1}([0,1], T_{v_2}T^*N)$ and satisfies the equation

$$\partial_t \hat{v}_2 - \hat{\eta}_2 X_F(t, v_0) = 0 \tag{A.5}$$

and the linearized boundary condition

$$\hat{v}_2(0) = d\varphi^1_{\eta_0 F+H,\mathfrak{m}}(v_0)[\hat{v}_2(1)]. \tag{A.6}$$

In fact, if we restrict the Hessian to $\mathcal{V}$ then equation (A.5) holds except at $t = \frac{1}{2}$, since the Hessian is a local operator. Thus, by continuity, equation (A.5) is still valid for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

From equation (A.4) we deduce that

$$\hat{v}_2(t) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \tag{A.7}$$

By (2.3), (A.5) becomes

$$\partial_t \hat{v}_2 - \hat{\eta}_2 \rho(t) X_{F_U}(v_0) = 0.$$

This is a linear ODE in the vector space $T_{v_0}T^*N$ as follows

$$\hat{v}_2(t) = \hat{v}_2(0) + \hat{\eta}_2 \left(\int_0^t \rho(\tau) d\tau \right) X_{F_U}(v_0). \tag{A.8}$$

Recall (2.2) that $\int_0^t \rho(\tau)d\tau = 1$ for all $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Combining this with equation (A.7) we conclude for $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$

$$0 = \hat{v}_2(t) = \hat{v}_2(0) + \hat{\eta}_2 X_{F_U}(v_0) \tag{A.9}$$

By using equations (A.6) and (A.7) at $t = 1$, we deduce $\hat{v}_2(0) = 0$. Now, put this into (A.9) we have

$$\hat{\eta}_2 X_{F_U}(v_0) = 0$$

Since (v_0, η_0) comes from a critical point (u_0, η_0) of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, we know $F_U(v_0) = F_U(u(0)) = k$, and we already assume that k is a regular value of F_U. In particular,

$$\hat{\eta}_2 = 0 \tag{A.10}$$

Equation (A.9), (A.10) and $\hat{v}_2(0) = 0$ imply

$$\hat{v}_2(t) = 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore, the annihilator of the image of $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ vanishes and thus $L_{(v_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ is surjective. □

Proof of Theorem A.1. First recall that $\mathcal{L} = W^{1,2}(S^1, T^*N)$ and $\mathfrak{B}^k = \{\beta \in C^k(S^1) : \beta(t) = 0,\ \forall t \in [0, 1/2]\}$. We define the Banach space bundle $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{L}$ by $\mathcal{E}_u = L^2(S^1, u^*T(T^*N))$. Now consider the section $S : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{B}^k \to \mathcal{E}^\vee \times \mathbb{R}$ given by the differential of the Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$

$$S(u, \eta, \beta) := d\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}(u, \eta). \tag{A.11}$$

where the perturbation $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}^k$ is considered as an additional variable. Its vertical differential $DS : T_{(u_0,\eta_0,\beta)}\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{B}^k \to \mathcal{E}^\vee_{(u_0,\eta_0,\beta)}$ at $(u_0, \eta_0, \beta) \in S^{-1}(0)$ is

$$DS_{(u_0,\eta_0,\beta)}[(\hat{u}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\beta})] = \mathscr{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\eta_0 F}}(u_0, \eta_0)[(\hat{u}, \hat{\eta}),\ \cdot\ ] + \int_0^1 \hat{\beta}(t)\sigma(\tau_*\partial_t \hat{u}(t),\ \cdot\ )dt \tag{A.12}$$

Since the pull-back of DS under the diffeomorphism $\Phi_{\eta_0 F + H, \mathfrak{m}} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathfrak{B}^k}$ is the operator $L_{v_0,\eta_0,\beta}$ in Proposition A.3, the operator DS is surjective. Thus, by the implicit function theorem the universal moduli space

$$\mathcal{M} := S^{-1}(0)$$

is a smooth Banach manifold. We consider the projection $\Pi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathfrak{B}^k$. Then the $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is Morse if and only if β is a regular value of Π. By the Sard-Smale theorem this forms a generic set for k large enough. Moreover, the Morse condition is C^k-open. Thus, for function in an open and dense subset of $\mathfrak{B}^k$ the Rabinowitz action functional is Morse. Taking the intersection of all k concludes the proof of Theorem A.1. □

Now we discuss the Morse property of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}^f$. Since we are interested in critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}^f$ with positive action value, it suffices to check the Morse property for the positive critical points.

Corollary A.4. *Given $a > 0$ and choose $f \in \mathcal{F}(a)$ (see, Definition 3.3). For a generic $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ the perturbed $\mathcal{F}$-Rabinowitz action functional $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}^f = \mathcal{A}_{H,\mathfrak{m}}^{F,f}$ is Morse on the action window $(a + c(H, \mathfrak{m}), \infty]$.*

Proof. Let $w_0 = (u_0, \eta_0)$ be a critical point of $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ with $\mathcal{A}^f_{\mathfrak{m}}(u_0, \eta_0) > a - c(H, \mathfrak{m})$ then by the argument in Proposition 3.4 we obtain $f(\eta_0) > a$. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}(a)$, we conclude $f'(\eta_0) = 1$. Hence the argument in the proof of Theorem A.1 definitely holds. This proves the corollary. □

Appendix B. No periodic magnetic leaf-wise intersection points

In this section, we study the second regularity property of $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathrm{Diff}_c(T^*N, \mathfrak{m})$, see Definition 2.3. The claim is that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{m}}$ has no periodic leaf-wise intersection points for generic $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$. In [3] Albers-Frauenfelder already studied the above property with respect to $H \in \mathcal{H}$. So as in Appendix A, we still work with $\beta \in \mathfrak{B}$ and modify the strategy of [3].

Recall that the hypersurface $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ is called non-degenerate if closed Reeb orbits on Σ form a discrete set. A generic Σ is non-degenerate, see [12, Theorem B.1]. If the critical points of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ does not meet any closed Reeb orbit then there are no periodic leaf-wise intersection points. Thus it suffices to prove the following theorem.

Theorem B.1. *Let $\Sigma \subset T^*N$ be a non-degenerate starshaped hypersurface and $\mathcal{R}$ be a set of closed Reeb orbit on Σ which form a discrete set. If $\dim N \geq 2$ then the set*

$$\mathfrak{B}_\Sigma := \{\beta \in \mathfrak{B} \ : \ \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} \textit{ is Morse and } \mathrm{im}\,(x) \cap \mathrm{im}\,(y) = \emptyset, \ \forall x \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}), \ y \in \mathcal{R}\} \tag{B.1}$$

is generic in $\mathfrak{B}$, see Definition 1.1.

Proof. We first define the evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ev} : \mathcal{M} &\to \Sigma \\ (u_0, \eta_0, \beta) &\mapsto u_0(\frac{1}{2}) \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the same as in the proof of Theorem A.1. Combining Proposition A.3 with Lemma B.2 below it follows that the evaluation map $\mathrm{ev}_\beta := \mathrm{ev}(\cdot, \cdot, \beta) : \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}) \to \Sigma$ is a submersion for a generic choice of β. Since $\dim T^*N \geq 4$, the preimage of the one dimensional set $\mathcal{R}^\tau := \{$ closed Reeb orbits with period $\leq \tau\}$ under ev_β does not intersect. Therefore, the set

$$\mathfrak{B}^n_\Sigma := \{\beta \in \mathfrak{B}^n \ : \ \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}} \text{ is Morse and } \mathrm{im}\,(x) \cap \mathrm{im}\,(y) = \emptyset, \ \forall x \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{m}}), \ y \in \mathcal{R}^n\} \tag{B.3}$$

is generic in $\mathfrak{B}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, the set $\mathfrak{B}_\Sigma$ is a countable intersection of the set $\mathfrak{B}^n_\Sigma$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This proves the Theorem B.1 □

The following lemma is contained in [3]. The proof is included for the reader's convenience.

Lemma B.2. Let $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{S}$ be a Banach bundle and $s : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{E}$ a smooth section. Moreover, let $\psi : \mathfrak{B} \to N$ be a smooth map into the Banach manifold N. We fix a point $x \in s^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{S}$ and set $K := \ker d\psi(x) \subset T_x\mathfrak{B}$ and assume the following two conditions.

1. The vertical differential $Ds|_K : K \to \mathcal{E}_x$ is surjective.
2. $d\psi(x) : T_x\mathfrak{B} \to T_{\psi(x)}N$ is surjective.

Then $d\psi(x)|_{\ker Ds(x)} : \ker Ds(x) \to T_{\psi(x)}N$ is surjective.

Proof. We fix $\xi \in T_{\psi(x)}N$. Condition (2) implies that there exists $\eta \in T_x\mathcal{S}$ satisfying $d\psi(x)\eta = \xi$. Condition (1) implies that there exists $\zeta \in K \subset T_x\mathcal{S}$ satisfying $Ds(x)\zeta = Ds(s)\eta$. We set $\tau := \eta - \zeta$ and compute

$$Ds(x)\tau = Ds(x)\eta - Ds(x)\zeta = 0$$

thus, $\tau \in \ker Ds(x)$. Moreover,

$$d\psi(x)\tau = d\psi(x)\eta - \underbrace{d\psi(x)\zeta}_{=0} = d\psi(x)\eta = \xi.$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] A. Abbondandolo, M. Schwarz, *On the Floer homology of cotangent bundles,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **59** (2006), 254-316

[2] A. Abbondandolo, M. Schwarz, *Estimates and computations in Rabinowitz-Floer homology*, Jour. Topology Analysis **1** (2009), no. 4, 307–405.

[3] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *Infinitely many leaf-wise intersections on cotangent bundles*, arXiv:0812.4426v2(2009).

[4] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *Leaf-wise intersections and Rabinowitz Floer homology*, J. Topol. Anal. **2** (2010), no. 1, 77-98

[5] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *Rabinowitz Floer homology: A survey*, arXiv:1001.4272(2010).

[6] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *A remark on a Theorem by Ekeland-Hofer*, to appear in Isr. J. Math. (2010).

[7] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *Spectral invariants in Rabinowitz Floer homology and global Hamiltonian perturbations*, Jour. of Mod. Dyn. **4** (2010), no. 2, 329–357.

[8] P. Albers, M. McLean, *Non-displaceable contact embeddings and infinitely many leaf-wise intersections,* arXiv:0904.3564, to appear in J. Symplectic Geometry.

[9] P. Albers, A. Momin, *Cup-length estimates for leaf-wise intersections,* arXiv:1002.3283.

[10] Y. Bae, U. Frauenfelder, *Continuation Homomorphism in Rabinowitz Floer homology for symplectic deformations*, Math. Proc. of the Cambridge Phil. Soc. **151** (2011), no. 3, 471-502

[11] A. Banyaga, *On fixed points of symplectic map*, Invent. Math. **57** (1980), no. 3, 215-229.

[12] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, *A Floer homology for exact contact embeddings*, Pacific J. Math. **239** (2009), no. 2, 251-316.

[13] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, *Morse homology on noncompact manifolds*, preprint arXiv:0911.1805.

[14] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, and A. Oancea, *Rabinowitz Floer homology and symplectic homology*, 2009, arXiv:0903.0768, to appear in Annales Scientifiques de L'ENS.

[15] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, and G. Paternain, *Symplectic topology of Mañé's critical value*, Geometry and Topology **14** (2010), 1765–1870.

[16] D. L. Dragnev, *Symplectic rigidity, symplectic fixed points and global perturbations of Hamiltonian dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **61** (2008), no. 3, 346-370.

[17] I. Ekeland and H. Hofer, *Two symplectic fixed-points theorems with applications to Hamiltonian dynamics*, J. Math. Pure et Appl. **68** (1989), no. 4, 467-489.

[18] A. Floer, *Wittens complex and infinite dimensional Morse theory*, J. Diff. Geom. **30** (1989), 207-221.

[19] U. Frauenfelder, F. Schlenk, *Hamiltonian dynamics on convex symplectic manifolds,* Isr. J. Math. **159** (2007), 1-56.

[20] V. Ginzburg, *Coisotropic Intersections*, Duke Math. J. **140** (2007), no. 1, 111-163.

[21] M. Gromov, *Kälher hyperbolicity and L_2-Hodge theory,* J. Differential Geom. 33(1) (1991) 263-292.

[22] M. Gromov, *Asymptotic invariants in group theory*, Geometric group theory II, G.A. Niblo and M.A. Roller, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes **182**, (1993).

[23] M. Gromov, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Progress in mathematics, **152** Birkäuser (1999).

[24] B. Z. Gürel, *Leaf-wise coisotropic intersections*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **5** (2010), 914-931.

[25] H. Hofer, *On the topological properties of symplectic maps*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **115** (1990), no. 1-2, 25-38.

[26] J. Kang, *Existence of leafwise intersection points in the unrestricted case,* arXiv:0910.2369(2009).

[27] J. Kang, *Generalized Rabinowitz Floer homology and coisotropic intersections,* arXiv:1003.1009(2010).

[28] J. Kang, *Survival of infinitely many critical points for the Rabinowitz action functional,* J. Modern Dynamics **4** (2010), no. 4, 733-739.

[29] J. Kędra, *Symplectically hyperbolic manifolds*, Differential Geometry and its Applications, 27 (2009), 455-463.

[30] L. Macarini, W. Merry, G. Paternain, *On the growth rate of leaf-wise intersections* 2011, arXiv:1101.4812v1

[31] A. Manning, *Relating exponential growth in a manifold and its fundamental group* Proc. American Math. Soc., **133** (2004), no. 4, 995-997.

[32] M. McLean, *The growth rate of symplectic homology and affine varieties*, 2010, arXiv:1011.2542

[33] W. Merry, *On the Rabinowitz Floer homology of twisted cotangent bundles*, to appear in Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations (2011).

[34] W. Merry, G. Paternain, *Index computations in Rabinowitz Floer homology*, preprint arXiv:1009.3870.

[35] J. Miranda, *Generic properties for magnetic flows on surfaces*, Nonlinearity **19** (2006), 1849–1874.

[36] J. Moser, *A fixed point theorem in symplectic geometry*, Acta, Math. **141** (1978), no. 1-2, 17-34.

[37] G. Paternain, *Magnetic rigidity of horocycle flows*, Pacific J. Math. **225** (2006), 301-323.

[38] S. Piunikhin, D. Salamon, M. Schwarz, *Symplectic Floer-Donaldson theory and quantum cohomology*, Publ. Newton. Inst. 8, ed. by Thomas, C. B., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1996, pp 171-200.

[39] L. Polterovich, *Growth of maps, distortion in groups and symplectic geometry*, Invent. Math. **150** (2002) no. 3, 655-686.

[40] A. F. Ritter, *Deformations of symplectic cohomology and exact Lagrangians in ALE spaces*, 2010, GAFA **20** (2010), no. 3, 779–816.

[41] J. Robbin, D. Salamon, *The Maslov index for paths*, Topology **32** (1993), no. 4, 827-884

[42] D. Salamon, *Lectures on Floer homology*, in Symplectic Geometry and Topology, Eds. Y. Eliashberg and L. Traynor. IAS/Park City Math. Series, vol. 7, AMS, 1999, 143-229.

[43] D. Salamon, E. Zehnder, *Morse Theory for Periodic Solutions of Hamiltonian System and the Maslov Index*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. **45** (1992), 1303-1360

[44] M. Schwarz, *Morse homology*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 111, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1993.

[45] J.-C. Sikorav, *Growth of a primitive of a differential form*, Bull. Soc. Math. France. **129** 2, (2001), 159-168.

[46] C. Viterbo, *Functors and computations in Floer homology with applications I*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **9** (1998), 985-1033.

[47] F. Ziltener, *Coisotropic submanifolds, leaf-wise fixed points and presymplectic embeddings*, J. Symp. Geom. **8** (2010), no. 4, 1-24.

Youngjin Bae, Department of Mathematics and Research Institute of Mathematics, Seoul National University

E-mail address: `jini0919@snu.ac.kr`